DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 051 SP 037 805

TITLE Portraits of Twelve High School Partner Schools in the National Network for Educational Renewal. National Network for Educational Renewal Reflections on Practice Series: No. 3.

INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.

PUB DATE 1997-11-00

NOTE 127p.

AVAILABLE FROM Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, Box 353600, Seattle, WA 98195-3600.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Educational Improvement; Faculty Development; *High Schools; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Public Schools; Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Improvement; Teachers

ABSTRACT

In the portraits of this collection, school- and university-based educators document their efforts to establish and sustain secondary partner schools that accomplish four purposes: educating children and youth; preparing new educators; providing professional development to current educators; and conducting inquiry. The 12 papers are as follows: "A Partnership of Possibilities: Aiken High School and Miami University" (William Kreuzmann); "The Dreher Story: An Evolving Partnership" (Laurie Brinker, Larry Winecoff, and Francie Markham); "Portrait of a Partnership: Dumont High School and Montclair State University" (Jeffrey Sheetz); "Experiencing the Promise of Simultaneous Renewal: A Portrait of Madeira Junior/Senior High School" (D.J. Hammond, Robert Larbes, and Bernard J. Badiali); "Portrait of the Northglenn High School/University of Colorado at Denver Partnership" (Deborah Arrowsmith and Rich Schweissing); "Secondary Partner School Portrait: Orem High School" (John Childs, John Gardner, Bus Gillespie, Merrell Hansen, Tina Howard, and Nancy Wentworth); "Parkway South High School/Maryville University. A Year of Ripples and Waves: Expanding and Extending the Partnership" (Kathe Rasch, Ron Banfield, Nancy Williams, Mary Ellen Finch, Craig Larson, Wayne Mosher, and Linda Pitelka); "Provo High School Portrait in Partnership with Brigham Young University" (Patti Harrington); "A Portrait of the Partnership Between Richland Northeast High School and Columbia College" (Lucy Snead); "The Rocky Mountain High School/Colorado State University PDS: A Way of Being" (Cori Mantle-Bromley); "Roosevelt High School Portrait of a Partnership with Harris-Stowe State College and Maryville University" (Nancy Williams); and "Initiating a Secondary Professional Development School: The Westfield High School/Texas A&M University Partnership" (William H. Peters). (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 418 051

Portraits of Twelve High School Partner Schools in the National Network for Educational Renewal

REFLECTIONS ON PRACTICE SERIES

No. 3

Center for Educational Renewal

November 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP037825

R. Soder

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Center for Educational Renewal
University of Washington
Box 353600
Seattle, Washington 98195-3600

(206) 543-6230

National Network for Educational Renewal
Reflections on Practice Series: No. 3

Portraits of Twelve High School Partner Schools in the National Network for Educational Renewal

November 1997

PREFACE

The Center for Educational Renewal and its partner, the Institute for Educational Inquiry, promote partner schools as settings for much of the challenging work of simultaneous renewal of schools and the education of educators. These schools–often referred to as professional development schools–are needed to satisfy the condition of Postulate 15 first identified by John I. Goodlad in *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*:

> Programs for the education of educators must assure for each candidate the availability of a wide array of laboratory settings for simulation, observation, hands-on experiences, and exemplary schools for internships and residencies; they must admit no more students to their programs than can be assured these quality experiences.

Previously, the Center issued a "compact" that defined the characteristics of successful partner schools. In that document (as in many other recent publications concerning such schools), four primary purposes for partner schools were identified:

1. Educating children and youth.
2. Preparing new educators.
3. Providing professional development to current educators.
4. Conducting inquiry.

In the portraits of this collection, school- and university-based educators document their efforts to establish and sustain secondary partner schools that accomplish these purposes in an exemplary manner.

This is the third paper in the Reflections on Practice Series from the Center for Educational Renewal. Papers in this series are offered in an effort to promote discussion amongst all of those professionals engaged in simultaneously renewing education for life in the moral and political democracy of the United States. We welcome your comments and suggestions.

Richard W. Clark
Senior Associate
Center for Educational Renewal

November 1997

ARTHUR VINING DAVIS FOUNDATIONS PROJECT:

SUPPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PARTNER (PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT) SCHOOLS

Development of high school professional development schools is a more challenging task than developing such schools for younger children. Traditionally, to a greater extent than for elementary schools, the preparation of secondary teachers has been a shared responsibility between education and arts and sciences departments at colleges and universities. Miscommunication or lack of communication between these parties has often been a characteristic of this shared effort. Moreover, the comprehensive high school of the later part of the twentieth century has been attacked on many fronts: for being too specialized or not specialized enough; for being too comprehensive or not comprehensive enough; for not adequately training teachers in their disciplines or for training teachers to be too subject-matter oriented; for not meeting "world class standards" or for failing to take into account the varied needs of the diverse population of young people. High school renewal efforts such as the Coalition of Essential Schools have acknowledged the need for enhanced preservice and continuing education of teachers but have not included attention to these needs as main parts of their agenda–particularly the preservice aspect of teacher development or attention to growth in teachers' knowledge of their disciplines.

In 1996-97, John Goodlad's Institute for Educational Inquiry received funding from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations to address this challenge. Twelve teams working with partner high schools throughout the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) participated in the project. Each team included at least five individuals: a high school teacher, a high school principal, a school district superintendent or assistant superintendent, a college of education faculty member, and a university faculty member from the arts and sciences.

Each team's work consisted of either initiating an effort where one had not begun or of moving an existing initiative ahead. Each team also began the process of sharing what it was learning with other high schools in the area. During February 1997, a 2½-day meeting was held for all twelve teams. Patricia Wasley, dean of the Bank Street Graduate School of Education, and Paul Heckman, professor at the University of Arizona, along with senior staff of Goodlad's Institute for Educational Inquiry met with the teams, providing ideas for the work and facilitating networking.

Finally, each team produced a brief written portrait of its school–the portraits you find in this collection. The authors of these portraits were encouraged to describe their school's work in a way that would be useful to their school's educators and to share their story in such a way that others interested in developing high school professional development schools would understand some of the pitfalls and promises of such work.

The schools participating in this project are listed below in the order in which their portraits appear:

HIGH SCHOOL	COLLABORATING UNIVERSITY	PROJECT LEADER	PORTRAIT AUTHOR(S)
Aiken High School Cincinnati, Ohio	Miami University	Sue Murphy Teacher, Aiken H.S.	William Kreuzmann
Dreher High School Columbia, South Carolina	University of South Carolina	Larry Winecoff College of Education, USC	Larry Winecoff
Dumont High School Dumont, New Jersey	Montclair State University	Jeffrey Scheetz Principal, Dumont H.S.	Jeffrey Scheetz
Madeira Junior/Senior H.S. Cincinnati, Ohio	Miami University	Martin Strifler Principal, Madeira H.S. Bernard Badiali School of Education, Miami	D. J. Hammond Bob Larbes Bernard Badiali
Northglenn High School Northglenn, Colorado	University of Colorado at Denver	Rich Schweissing (NGHS) Deborah Arrowsmith (UCD) Site Coordinators, Northglenn High School	Deborah Arrowsmith Rich Schweissing
Orem High School Orem, Utah	Brigham Young University	Tina Howard Alpine School District	Tina Howard, with Project Team
Parkway South High School St. Louis, Missouri	Maryville University	Mary Ellen Finch School of Ed., Maryville	Kathe Rasch, with Project Team
Provo High School Provo, Utah	Brigham Young University	Patti Harrington Principal, Provo H.S.	Patti Harrington
Richland Northeast H.S. Columbia, South Carolina	Columbia College	Lucy Snead Math Dept., Columbia	Lucy Snead
Roosevelt High School St. Louis, Missouri	Harris-Stowe State College Maryville University	Mary Ellen Finch Maryville University	Nancy Williams
Rocky Mountain High School Fort Collins, Colorado	Colorado State University	Ann Foster Poudre School District	Cori Mantle-Bromley
Westfield High School Houston, Texas	Texas A&M University	Robert G. Smith Spring Independent School District	William Peters

For more information about the project, please contact Richard W. Clark at:

Institute for Educational Inquiry
124 East Edgar Street
Seattle, Washington 98102

NATIONAL NETWORK FOR EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

Institute for Educational Inquiry
124 East Edgar Street
Seattle, WA 98102
206.325.3010 tel
206.328.9279 fax

Center for Educational Renewal
College of Education, Box 353600
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3600
206.543.6230 tel ◆ 206.543.8439 fax

Representing a comprehensive cross section of teacher education programs, arts and sciences departments, schools, and school districts across the United States, the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) includes small private colleges, flagship research universities, historically black colleges, and rural universities, among others. The institutions admitted to the NNER all are committed to following the simultaneous renewal agenda for schools and the education of educators (as described by John Goodlad in his 1990 book, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. In *Teachers*, and later in *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*, Goodlad lays out nineteen "postulates," or conditions that must be in place in teacher education programs and schools to prepare effective teachers able to meet the obligations of educating our nation's youth.

In keeping with the basic collaborative agenda of simultaneous renewal, each NNER setting consists of one or more institutions of higher education working in collaboration with one or more school districts and one or more partner schools within each district. The NNER currently is comprised of 16 settings in 14 states, embracing 34 colleges and universities, over 100 school districts, and more than 400 partner schools.

A key part of the strategy for simultaneous renewal of schools and the programs that prepare those who are to be stewards of the schools is the tripartite collaboration of leaders in the schools, colleges of education, and colleges of arts and sciences. Arts and sciences faculty must be directly engaged in the general education of future teachers, both in helping future teachers gain subject-matter knowledge and in working directly with the schools. The agenda supports the idea that education and democracy are intrinsically linked and that schools have a crucial *public* purpose: to enculturate young people to live and work in a social and political democracy (see *Democracy, Education, and the Schools*, edited by Roger Soder; *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling*, edited by John Goodlad and Timothy McMannon; and *In Praise of Education*, by John Goodlad).

The National Network for Educational Renewal is supported by two organizations, both located in Seattle, Washington: the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington and the independent Institute for Educational Inquiry.

NNER Settings

Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership

California Polytechnic State University

Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal (5)*

Metropolitan St. Louis Consortium for Educational Renewal (2)

Miami University of Ohio

Montclair State University/New Jersey Network for Educational Renewal

Nebraska Network for Educational Renewal (10)

South Carolina Network for Educational Renewal (5)

Texas A&M University

University of Connecticut/Connecticut School-University Partnership

University of Hawaii at Manoa/Hawaii School-University Partnership

University of Southern Maine/Southern Maine Partnership

University of Texas at El Paso

University of Washington

University of Wyoming/Wyoming School-University Partnership

Wright State University

** Number of institutions of higher education in the multi-institution NNER settings.*

A Partnership of Possibilities:
Aiken High School and Miami University

By William Kreuzmann, Aiken High School

The complexities of urban education are formidable. The renewal process under way at Aiken High School through a partnership with Miami University is a grassroots attempt to address some of those complexities in a pragmatic fashion. Through this partnership, issues are being addressed at the school level as well as at the university level. Our efforts at reform originate from a common concern for our students as they attempt to navigate their way through an increasingly complex world within a system of education that places economic efficiency as its main priority rather than the education of a democratic citizenry. A direct result of the education of a democratic citizenry is the empowerment of our students oppressed by the dominant culture. Therefore, our interest has evolved into an attempt, through the partnership, to deal with the issues of student empowerment via democratic education and an attempt to bridge the growing gap between inner-city and suburban America. As stated by John Goodlad in *A Place Called School*, "There is in the gap between our highly idealistic goals for schooling in our society and the differentiated opportunities condoned and supported in schools a monstrous hypocrisy . . . We will only begin to get evidence of the potential power of pedagogy when we dare to risk and support markedly deviant classroom procedures."

This portrait is my interpretation of this partnership. It is my trying to make sense of the discussions that have happened over the past year. It is a recognition of how we began and where we are attempting to go. Within this context, it is also important to examine the benefits being received, not only by Aiken students and faculty but by Miami students and faculty as well. Also, while not within the scope of this portrait, it is important to acknowledge that broad organizational change must be linked with the above-mentioned benefits. For the results of this renewal process to be most effective, they must be supported not only at the local level but at the broader administrative levels as well, both at Miami University and Cincinnati Public Schools. Such support is very important in order to maintain an ongoing program of improvement.

The process of renewal began with the intellectual and philosophical recognition that traditional methods of educating urban students were not working. Those involved in the initial process saw the need to accept the challenge of taking responsibility for our students in a holistic fashion. We recognized that attempting to deal solely with academic standards and discipline without addressing the social, emotional, and economic realities of our students' lives is irresponsible policy and pedagogically indefensible. We also realized that the "crisis" in public education is

primarily a reference to urban public education. The institution of education is, as are other social institutions, cumbersome and slow to recognize and respond to social change. Therefore, our motivation for renewal was derived from a desire to accept the challenge to do a more effective job of serving our students as well as identifying with the conditions of their lives, thus lifting the veil of crisis from urban public education and placing it on society at large.

A History of the Partnership

"Aiken High School is a comprehensive neighborhood school serving a variety of students. The average daily membership of Aiken is 1,267: 85 percent are African-American, 13.24 percent are Caucasian, 0.60 percent are of mixed race, 0.15 percent are Native American, and 0.15 percent are Asian. Fifty-two percent of our students are female and 48 percent are male. The composition of our certificated staff is as follows: 38.6 percent male, 61.4 percent female, 30.1 percent African-American, 68.7 percent Caucasian, and 1.2 percent Asian" (Aiken's 1995-96 *Annual School Report*).

Near the end of the 1994-95 school year, a group of eight to ten progressive-minded teachers from Aiken and a professor and four graduate students from Miami University's Department of Educational Leadership began meeting outside school. Within weeks of forming the discussion group, the members' attention began to focus on teaming and the concept of a "school-within-a-school." During this period of time, several of these teachers visited Fairdale High School in Louisville, Kentucky, in order to observe a practice of teaming in progress. The trip and necessary substitute teachers were paid for by Miami University, furthering its activist role in school reform and renewal.

The teachers were impressed with what they saw in Louisville and, within the next six months, began to organize "the team" for the coming 1995-96 school year. The team included faculty and graduate students from Miami University. Participants began to lobby for team members, team space, and the opportunity to put the process into action. A proposal was written and presented to the administration to establish an interdisciplinary team that would focus its attention on 125 to 150 ninth-grade students for two years. The team proposal was approved as long as the process would not incur any additional cost. Therefore, with virtually no budget and no formal support, the concept of teaming and the partnership with Miami University began at Aiken High School.

Initially, within the context of working with our students in a holistic fashion, the team wanted to inject a sense of the democratic process into the classroom. A great deal of what has been done was based on the idea of trying to create an environment in which our students would connect with one another and their teachers. It was hoped that such an environment would create a sense of community among the students as well as ownership of one's education. It was believed that in so

doing students would no longer feel threatened by school and, at some point, begin to feel empowered to guide their own education. By dealing with the issues in our students' lives that hindered the educational process, our expectations were that we could help them stay on track academically so that in two years they would receive the necessary credits to move them toward graduation and they would have access to the tools of democracy. The idea then, was to use teaming as the delivery system for our attempts to positively influence our students.

Contending with the entirety of our students' lives requires a flexibility that does not exist in a philosophy that encourages a "one best way" or a most "efficient way" of doing things. Therefore, the process of change we have embarked on flies in the face of the positivist paradigm currently in practice in many school systems. It is ineffective to present material to students with the hope that it will eventually improve the quality of their lives when, too often, their current life situations beg immediate attention. Thus, adapting curriculum in an attempt to address issues relevant to students is vital. Such a connection hopefully produces an interest in and a desire to remain in school. Within this context, we hope that our students begin to see how they "fit" in the world, not just today or tomorrow but in the foreseeable future. It is part of our purpose to help our students decide the directions in which they need to move in order to help them identify and accomplish their goals.

Current Connections with Miami

It is important that we have the tools at our disposal to address student concerns that may have a direct impact on the educational environment. This is a fundamental need when one is concerned with the entire student. It is difficult to work with students who are preoccupied with child care, abuse in the home, or whether a "true home" in fact exists. Therefore, if effective renewal/reform is to take place in the urban environment then a progressive democratic discourse must take place, not only between teachers but within classrooms among students. There should also be a variety of social services present in the school working to help students cope with their situations and help teachers better understand the implications and complexities these situations will create in the classroom.

Although I refer to our efforts as those of the partnership and the team, these entities include individuals with diverse life experiences. One of the valuable aspects of our partnership is that the people involved have arrived at the process of renewal and reform from different places. The factors that brought us together are, in my view, issues that are inevitably inseparable. First, as educators, how do we view the purpose of education? Flowing from that question is the issue of urban education. Is urban education struggling because the dominant cultural view of education does not address the needs of urban students? Our partnership with Miami University is fueled by these issues. They call into question how new teachers are trained for careers in urban education and what

the urban classroom will look like in the future. In addition, if the work of our partnership shows positive results over time, how will our change in philosophy be received by the larger educational system?

Although our team is the unit around which this partnership formed, the partnership is not limited to teaming. As alluded to earlier, the team is the conduit through which ideas developed by the partnership flow.

This partnership addresses, from a variety of perspectives, a relationship between public education, particularly urban schools, as modernist institutions in increasingly postmodern times. Dr. Dennis Carlson, the partnership liaison from Miami, contends that curriculum, as viewed by the state, is seen as reified fragments of knowledge that are transformed into educational outcomes and thus become the standards against which students are evaluated. The evaluation of student performance based upon uniform standardized norms then tracks students into paths aimed at either promising futures or futures filled with risk.

One result of our discussions with Dr. Carlson is the concern that if curriculum continues to be designed to reproduce dominant culture, the result will be a limiting of the potential schools have to be sites of democratic empowerment. This is especially true for those students marginalized by class, race, and gender. As a partnership and a team, we must be very cautious about such a limiting process. We, as a team, had most of our success in the prevention of such a process. We were able to develop, in two years, a strong sense of community among our students. They identified with the team which, in turn, created a sense of security that, I feel, contributed to the great majority of the students staying in school. In addition, we are building much of our curriculum for the 1997-98 school year around the notion of democratic process; therefore, we must be careful not to allow ourselves to be limited by such a process of cultural reproduction. This, I believe, can be done by constant reflection by partnership/team members. Dr. Carlson has expressed, in discussion, the importance of maintaining a willingness to be different and to try new ideas, even at the risk of failure. His concern in this regard is that schools must not allow themselves to be seen as totally determined sites. Sue Murphy consistently reminds us to think "outside the box."

One of the initial members of our partnership/team was Elizabeth Lokon. As a graduate student at Miami, Elizabeth based her doctoral dissertation on the teaming process at Aiken High School. In it, she identified the sense of community among our students and teachers as "social capital": "Social capital is embodied in the relations between persons. Trust, trustworthiness, and collegiality are all examples of social capital. They are forms of 'capital' because they facilitate the achievement of goals that could not be achieved in its absence or could be achieved only at a higher cost" (Lokon, 1997, p.38). I believe that the following statements by several of our students taken from research done by Elizabeth are representative of "social capital" developed in the first year of teaming at Aiken (Lokon, 1997, p. 6-7).

Student #1: It helps [being on a team] because we see the same faces everyday. We know each other well. So, when someone is capping [teasing], we know it's just capping. We don't fight because we know each other. We're making friends because we see each other not only one hour, one year. We're making friends for life.

Student #2: With the team, the teachers know how you work. You don't have to worry about them jumping down your throat. They know when you are in a bad mood and they let you be.

Student #3: You have to get used to people, how they teach, get to know each other. In the team it's easier.

Student #4: You try more because you can relax. So, you get to focus more, concentrate more. You don't have to worry about what other people are thinking. It's more like a challenge.

Student #5: We have more freedom in the team since [the teachers] **know our limits,** what we need to do to make us learn.

Student #6: We know [the teachers] care. That makes it easier.

One of the important factors in creating a successful team is a similarity in philosophy among the teachers on a team. One of the problems that we have faced and continue to face is finding team members that share a philosophy and commitment to teaming and the partnership. When teachers move on and off the team, "social capital" is difficult, if not impossible, to create and maintain.

We have been successful at creating an environment that encourages feelings of caring, belonging, and security. We are, however, a long way from presenting ourselves to anyone as an example to be modeled. We are very much a work in progress. That work is currently focused on three principal areas. First, we are working toward developing a radical pedagogy that will encompass aspects of "education as empowerment" that we feel are necessary to adequately address our students needs. Second, we are working on developing an interdisciplinary curriculum that will interest students because it has an authentic application to their lives. Within this context, we are working with Dr. Fuller of Miami's Department of Teacher Education to create a model through which preservice teachers can have a greater impact on our students and have a more meaningful experience for themselves. Finally, as stated previously, we are interested in trying to contribute to

the narrowing of the growing gap between urban and suburban America. Dr. Simcock, a professor in Miami's Department of Sociology, is working closely with us in doing what we can to accomplish this goal.

Radical pedagogy is an overarching philosophy rather than a body of knowledge. It seeks to instill in students a sense of the critical. That is, "Critical education operates on two basic assumptions. One, there is a need for a language of critique, a questioning of presuppositions. Radical educators, for example, criticize and indeed reject the notion that the primary purpose of public education is economic efficiency. Schools are more than company stores. They have the much more radical purpose of educating citizens. Which is why the second base assumption of radical education is a language of possibility. It goes beyond critique, to elaborate a positive language of human empowerment" (Giroux, 1992, p.10). The reason Giroux's concept of radical pedagogy fits our partnership so well can be explained by three distinguishing traits: "Radical education is interdisciplinary in nature, it questions the fundamental categories of all disciplines, and it has a public mission of making society more democratic" (Giroux, 1992, p.10).

The challenge to us as "radical educators" is to create a curriculum that motivates our students to buy into the idea that education can be a liberating experience. That is, if students participate in our curriculum, they will recognize that through experience comes empowerment.

Empowerment, in this sense, means to become critical thinkers as well as critical actors. Paulo Freire, in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* identifies critical thinking as being able to understand, analyze, pose questions, and affect and effect the social, political, and economic realities that shape our lives. As we move toward a strong democratic basis for our curriculum, we as a partnership/team should bear in mind that democracy is a celebration of difference. This, to me, means that our students are to be encouraged, within an academic context, to critically question dominant social institutions rather than merely adapt to them. This, we believe, will be accomplished through the eventual development of an authentic project-based curriculum developed and implemented by our partnership team.

The importance of an authentic project-based curriculum can be further explained through the concept of "bricolage" brought to the team by Dr. Carlson. The concept, as applied to education, suggests that we base our curriculum in the here-and-now and use what is at hand to address our students' concrete needs. In other words, we should remain open enough to build on and take advantage of educational experiences and opportunities as they present themselves to us.

One such opportunity of a sort is Co-Nect, a project-based curriculum that utilizes technology as a tool in the classroom. Co-Nect is a model that was presented to us by New American Schools and is going to be piloted by our team at Aiken. While we recognize the importance of technology for our students, we believe it will be the authenticity of the projects and

their relevance to our students' lives that will make the difference. The technology will enhance our ability to bring current resources into the classroom.

One of the very promising developments of our partnership with Miami is the connection we have made with Dr. Fuller. We first met Dr. Fuller at an NNER meeting held at Aiken in the fall of 1996. Dr. Fuller's focus is primarily the improvement of teaching in secondary schools. He is concerned not only with the quality of education our students receive but, just as importantly, the quality of training that preservice teachers receive prior to entering the job market. In our conversations, an observation that Dr. Fuller has frequently made is that student teachers tend to teach the way they have seen teaching modeled for them; thus, if one's professors and cooperating teachers stand in front of the class and lecture, student teachers will do the same. In an attempt to combat this one-dimensional teaching style, Dr. Fuller is quite selective in the placement of his student teachers.

From our standpoint as urban school teachers, we feel that it is very important for our students to have teachers that truly want to teach in this kind of environment. As a consequence, we have discussed getting education students out of the college classrooms and into the field as early and as frequently as possible. The hope is that as a result of a wide variety of experiences, students may begin to identify the type of environment in which they would like to teach. If such an identification can be made, they can focus the remainder of their college careers on the development of methods and skills that will serve them best in the environment they have chosen. While there is no guarantee students will be hired into their district of choice, they nevertheless can guide their careers in their chosen direction. It is obvious to our students at Aiken when they have teachers who do not want to be there. Also, the sooner student teachers are out in the schools, the sooner some may recognize that teaching is not what they really want to do–again, a service to both our students and the student teachers who make that recognition.

Future Directions

Some very exciting and motivating ideas have been the center of discussion within the context of our partnership team. While these ideas are still in the conceptual stages, I believe they hold a great deal of promise for urban education and our partnership with Miami. First, teachers and university professors team teach methods classes at Miami. At the same time, university professors periodically team with partner school teachers in the school environment. Second, develop a new model for student teaching experiences and, finally, alter the current method for supervising student teachers.

It seems that there is a great opportunity for partner schools to share material and intellectual resources. Having teachers and professors team at both the school and university sites provides a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

chance for both to maintain an awareness of the climates that exist at each location. It is a way for the teacher to discuss issues of concern for students planning for careers in teaching. It is also a way to provide information about a variety of teaching methods–what has worked and what has not. The opportunity also exists for university professors to get into a high school classroom periodically and refresh his or her memory as to the experiences once had. The hope is that the more experiences that can be acquired by teachers and professors at each site, the more students will benefit.

In discussing new models for preservice teaching, Dr. Fuller and I have agreed to place two preservice teachers in my classroom simultaneously in the fall of the 1997-98 school year. The opportunity to have three teachers working together in a classroom has several implications. Students learn in a variety of ways and at varying rates of speed. This will be a great opportunity to work with students on a more personal level, providing encouragement, providing remediation when needed, and constantly challenging students to improve the quality of their work. I also believe that working closely with our students can help raise their self-esteem. In addition, there is potential for preservice teachers to be less intimidated by an urban school setting and thus have a better student teaching experience. It will, I believe, serve to "humanize" our students for those preservice teachers that come into our school with preconceived notions of what an urban school is.

Finally, the possibility has been discussed of training teachers on site to serve as supervisors for preservice teachers at their schools. This, of course, is in the very early stages of discussion but could conceivably improve the quality of supervision for preservice teachers. At the same time, it could improve the level of communication between the university professor and the sites at which students are assigned. However, as stated earlier in this portrait, successfully implementing any of these changes will require wide-ranging change within the administrations of both Miami University and Cincinnati Public Schools.

The partnership/team is also attempting to address, as stated earlier, the larger social issue of the growing gap between inner-city and suburban America. Dr. Simcock, an integral part of this process, recruited Miami students to travel to Aiken in order to tutor and assist in our classes. Because Dr. Simcock is a sociologist, many of the volunteers have been sociology majors. However, flyers and announcements for volunteers were spread across the campus resulting not only in sociology majors but also students from many other majors motivated as much by general social concern as by career interests in teaching or social service work to volunteer. The rationale for this aspect of the partnership is put best by Dr. Simcock: "Many, but by no means all, of Miami's students come from socially advantaged homes and families. If they were to do no more than do well in their studies, their career futures would already be relatively secure. But many of them also realize that the larger society in which they and their children must live is dangerously threatened by divisions of wealth, class, and education. Therefore, as a complement to their studies of American society, they are provided an opportunity to gain first-hand knowledge of the world in and around inner-city

schools." Volunteerism also has the potential of increasing the civic responsibility of those students who participate in the program.

After utilizing this aspect of the partnership for most of the 1996-97 school year, we recognized some improvements that must be made in order to make this process more effective for the 1997-98 school year. Initially, our volunteer format was fairly loose; that is, Miami students came down to Aiken and tried to fit themselves into whatever was going on in class as best they could. As a result, there were instances when some of the volunteers felt awkward and out of place. I had a sense, at times, that we were wasting their time. This year, however, we are determined to do a better job of building the volunteers into our lesson plans. As a result of including volunteers in our class plans, we will need to have a minimum degree of continuity in the Miami students coming down to Aiken. It will be helpful to know how many students are coming and if they are the same as had previously been down. In addition, it may be possible to offer internship credit to the students who participate as volunteers.

While it is too early to tell what the long-term effects this aspect of the partnership are on Aiken and Miami students, it is clear that Aiken students enjoy the attention they receive from the Miami volunteers. The impact of the relationship is often shown through the expression of hopeful questions about when volunteers will come next. This gives us cause for optimism and reason to work toward more effective use of Miami's volunteers.

Conclusion

Henry Giroux, in *Border Crossings*, states very clearly a problem in urban education that we are also concerned about when he asks, "Can learning take place if in fact it silences the voices of the people it is supposed to teach?" He answers, "Yes. People learn that they don't count" (1992, p.15). I think a large part of this partnership is creating a space in which people learn they do count. Based upon what I have experienced, I now value in a much deeper sense the possibilities that the partnership offers. Our goal, I think, is to nurture a democratic community in which all students– school and university alike– have both a voice and a relationship with each other that goes well beyond the traditional academic setting. We are not working just to support and benefit ourselves and our students, but to support the university teachers and their students, too.

The core of the partnership, it seems to me, is the connection between people; you cannot change institutions alone, but you can build connections between people. Through human connections, we change institutions. If you had visited my classroom this past year, you would have seen the partnership in action. Four preservice teachers planned and presented a lesson about the development of national identity and immigration laws. By breaking into small groups, they engaged students in meaningful dialogue for the entire class period. Usually, students begin zipping their

coats and putting on their backpacks several minutes before the bell rings. That day, however, when the bell rang, nobody moved and one student complained audibly, "Damn, this went too quick!"

References

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Giroux, H. (1992). *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Lokon, E. (1997). *Teaming in an Urban High School: Commitment. Collaboration. and Contradictions*. Miami University: Doctoral Dissertation.

THE DREHER STORY: AN EVOLVING PARTNERSHIP

By Laura Brinker and Larry Winecoff, University of South Carolina,
and Francie Markham, Dreher High School

Dreher High School is an exciting place with all of the challenges of a diverse student body and a long history of academic excellence. The tradition remains strong, as can be seen by the many awards for excellence the school has received over the years. This includes having the largest number of merit scholars of any high school in South Carolina last year (sixteen in 1997) and graduating several students who, over the past several years, have scored a perfect 1600 on the SAT.

A professional development high school provides a set of unique challenges for professional development for the teachers, the university faculty, and the future educators. This portrait tells the story of how the partnership between the University of South Carolina (USC) and Dreher High School evolved over the past two years. Within this story, the struggles and triumphs will be described through the voices of many key players: Dreher teachers, USC faculty, and former USC students who are now teachers at Dreher. These voices will highlight the evolution of this particular partnership within the goals that have been outlined by several national initiatives such as National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), NEA's Teacher Education Initiative, and the Holmes Group reports (1995).

There are many wonderful reasons why Dreher became a partner with the University of South Carolina (USC). One reason was the concerted effort of USC faculty members to expand the network of professional development schools (PDSs), particularly at the secondary level. Before the Dreher partnership, USC had only one other partner high school. The need to expand the number of high school partners was very apparent. However, Dreher was much more than "just another school." Because of its convenient location to the USC campus, many faculty members already enjoyed a relationship with this school through family or friend connections. In addition, the location made it a convenient choice to place students for practical experience.

The issue of convenience, however, does not necessarily make for a strong partnership. The real strength in the development of this partnership rests in the hands of a highly committed and talented group of teachers and their administrators at Dreher who genuinely wanted to promote the professional development of themselves and their preservice teachers at the high school level. The Holmes Group describes the uniqueness of a PDS as follows:

> In such schools, experienced teachers, conscious of membership in a profession, help teach and induct new members. Also, by pulling together and demonstrating

their know-how, by questioning their assumptions and routines, by taking part in research and development projects, they keep on learning to teach. They contribute their experience and wisdom to the profession's systematic fund of knowledge (Holmes Group).

The teachers at Dreher have continually sought opportunities to expand their own knowledge base through collaboratives with USC college of education faculty and arts and science faculty in order to prepare future teachers with the most innovative pedagogy in the various content areas.

This portrait will be divided into three sections. The first section will provide a brief history of Dreher high school. In the second section, the evolution of the partnership will be described from the perspectives of Dreher and USC faculty. Finally, the portrait will conclude with a discussion of goals, both short-term and long-term, for this partnership.

Dreher's History

Originally built in 1938, Dreher High School, located in downtown Columbia, South Carolina, has been modernized and expanded into a modern, comprehensive high school. Dreher is a Nationally Recognized School of Excellence offering challenging academic courses as well as a wide variety of outstanding extracurricular and athletic programs. The award-winning faculty challenges a diverse student body to excel on standardized tests ranging from Advanced Placement Exams to the South Carolina Exit Exam. Dreher has a student body of 1,250, with a faculty of 66 supported by 5 administrators. The school is characterized as having a fifty/fifty student body in terms of gender, socio-economic status, and ethnicity (African-American and Caucasian, with only a few Hispanics).

The University of South Carolina and Dreher have enjoyed a long history of working together in the areas of staff development, curriculum improvement, and student teaching experiences. During 1978-79, USC and Dreher entered into a formal relationship and established a "Professional Development Center" on site with a faculty member and a doctoral-level graduate assistant working half time. However, the initiative was discontinued after two years. Still, a high level of collaborative interest between the two entities remained.

In 1994, USC modified its initial teacher licensure program by moving to a five-year graduate program with an education minor at the undergraduate level. During the planning process, the possibility for a more formal relationship was again initiated by faculty members from Dreher and USC. USC started its Professional Development School Network in 1989 but had only one high school in the group of eleven schools.

While 1996-97 was technically a planning year following USC-PDS Network expansion guidelines, including a self-study and site visits by USC and school-based PDS practitioners, many components of a "working" partnership were initiated. These included a site-based undergraduate practicum coordinated and taught by Dreher teachers, a year-long internship for MT students, and regular semester-long student teaching by MAT students. During peak times in the spring semester, up to forty-five USC students were engaged in a variety of experiences at Dreher along with several students from Benedict College. Benedict is a member, with USC, in the South Carolina Network for Educational Renewal (an NNER site) and has joined with USC in forming the Dreher Partnership.

The Partnership

Key players in the evolving USC-Dreher partnership were asked to tell their stories as part of the portrait painting process. These included administrators and faculty at USC, administrators and faculty at Dreher, and three new Dreher teachers who were part of the partnership initiatives as USC students last year (during 1996-97).

The partnership has been described by some as *fragile*. It has enjoyed many high points and encountered many challenges. The evolution of the partnership has been visualized in many different ways by members of the tripartite. The metaphor given by one of the members most aptly describes the relationship "as the planting of flowers where roots and blossoms are all in a relationship with the plant; there are the seeds of professional development; the roots are the teachers in the school; the blossoms are the future teachers–all energized through the partnership".

Initial Meetings

Members of the USC-Dreher professional development school steering group attended the Arthur Vining Davis Secondary Partner School team meeting in Phoenix. This activity enabled the group to become better acquainted informally, to discuss problems of mutual interest, and to interact with others pursuing the same goals. Similar teams from eight other states participated. Each of the participating schools made presentations. We heard about the benefits derived from professional development school relationships and the labor necessary to foster the collaboration. Teachers and principals spoke of the benefits of contributing to the development of new teachers and interacting with university faculty. They also pointed to the challenges of coordinating the PDS effort along with their regular responsibilities.

Higher education faculty were able to meet with peers who discussed reward system problems and perceptions that faculty who spend significant time in PDSs are not contributing to the work of their units (a loss of collegiality). Arts and sciences faculty discussed ways that they might

contribute to the Partnership–there was a difference between smaller institutions in which higher education faculty was directly involved in teacher preparation and research institutions where the arts and sciences faculty was indirectly involved.

Our team's response was one of enthusiasm and support for the Network's goals and for the conference. Arts and sciences faculty shared the excitement and saw for the first time the importance of the whole project. Generally, they felt that the idea of a school-university partnership was worthwhile–the challenge, they felt, was to locate the right people, put them to work, minimize meetings, and maximize teaching/student contact. There was general support for the university-school partnership (working together with student teachers and practicum students, etc.) and the stimulation of thinking about school reform.

Developing the Partnership

The initial meetings in Phoenix provided an important juncture in the development of the USC-Dreher partnership. All involved realized the advantages to the partnership. One major advantage of being a partner school is that it may nurture relationships with some of USC's best students. The university, in turn, has a chance to place its interns/student teachers with highly qualified teachers who have a serious commitment to professional development. Three of the top student teachers at Dreher have been hired at Dreher this fall. We feel an even stronger connection with them. One of our goals is to continue the relationship with these beginning teachers beyond their first year of teaching.

Being in a PDS is different from just placing interns/student teachers with "good teachers," making some observations, and talking with the teacher about the intern's performance. With the partnership focus, we look at improving the teaching of the professor, the classroom teacher, and the intern. The Holmes Group acknowledges the importance of this distinction in the creation of an "authentic PDS" (1995, p. 79). At Dreher, the expectation from both the high school and USC is that as we work together we will not only improve the preparation of teachers but also improve the curriculum and instructional practices in the school.

Arts and Sciences Connection/Integration of Technology

A large part of the partnership is the arts and sciences connection and the infusion of innovative curricula with technology. One of the current initiatives involves an inquiry project conducted by a math educator and mathematician from USC and a math teacher at Dreher.

It is an exciting project that involves the integration of technology in a geometry class. In addition to the innovative instruction that the high school teacher explores, this project provides an

opportunity for the professor in math or science to find out the kinds of instructional techniques being used at the high school level. The math department is research focused and uses a lecture format. Seeing innovative practices may have an impact on college teaching. Furthermore, the mathematics education faculty will see improvement in content taught at the high school level and the math teacher at Dreher will provide new pedagogical strategies.

The integration of technology into the day-to-day curriculum has become an important issue. USC interns have learned to use educational technology as part of their teacher education program. The USC students take it, use it, share it, and pass it on to the high school students. In some ways, the interns are helping to change teachers' behaviors (e.g., taking laser discs out of closet, using them, and helping the teacher learn how to use them). Department chairs at Dreher now know how to incorporate laser disc technology into their instruction.

Some Immediate Benefits

Dreher has been able to experience first hand the quality of many of the student teachers that are coming through the USC program. Interdisciplinary studies are brought to students through the new views of student teachers. Many of these student teachers bring in a fresh view or approach to teaching methods from which the students benefit. Innovative ideas and technology such as graphing calculators, inquiry-based learning, and laser discs are all elements that are developed in methods courses; veteran staff at Dreher may not be familiar with the new techniques.

Recent interviews with teachers and administrators from Dreher highlight the added incentives of being associated with a PDS. The teachers acknowledge the benefits gained from this partnership. Francie Markham, an English teacher and staunch supporter of the partnership commented on these benefits:

> One of the greatest benefits has been the Eric Nortons and Beth Olivers who we hired this year. It is so much better to see how they interact and see how they fit in at Dreher. Also, it is interesting to have the interactions with people at the university. We haven't had a defined relationship in the past. Relationships have broadened and we have had an opportunity to branch out. I think of it as an important step. It has given many other teachers the opportunity to get involved with preservice teachers. Our doors are more broadly opened. I like the fact that we get to know people at other levels (other professionals) . . . like the Maine and the Phoenix experience. I liked the fact that no one had titles. We talked about issues that have an effect on all of us. (October 1997)

Her comments reinforce the concept of the PDS as a true partner with the university where ideas are shared freely and traditional barriers are broken.

While the Dreher teachers acknowledge the benefits to their school, they also point out the benefits to USC. In particular, they emphasize that the unique diversity of their school makes it an ideal place to provide authentic experiences for preservice teachers. In the same interview, Ms. Markham described this uniqueness:

> They need experiences at a place like this–not a place like many of the suburban schools. Even with all of our diversity, people have the image that we have recruited academically talented students. We have a tradition of excellence in our student body. Nowhere else is there a fifty/fifty high school–not fifty/fifty in every class but in the school. USC students get to relate to both the most energetic learners and the least motivated learners. (October 1997)

The principal of Dreher, Rae McPherson, further emphasized the importance of diversity, saying:

> From an administrator's point of view, it is the diversity that I value. Interns bring different styles to instruction and students benefit from seeing different styles of teaching. The caliber of preservice teacher is so good now. At Dreher, USC students are getting a chance to be mentored by outstanding professionals. The students have more choices of who to be with because of the partnership. More teachers are involved. I don't think there is anywhere in South Carolina where teachers work any harder than at Dreher. (October 1997)

Three new teachers at Dreher were hired as a result of their student teaching experience last year. These three teachers were considered by many faculty members to be among USC's top candidates last year. They provided a refreshing perspective about the partnership. They all had the opportunity to hear about the PDS ideas as student teachers at Dreher. This was a tremendous opportunity for Dreher to reap the benefits of having young, newly trained teachers with new ideas (i.e., technology), and the Dreher administration and teachers took advantage of this by making sure that all three teachers were hired full time.

These new teachers also benefit from being hired in a PDS because this environment will stimulate their efforts to continue their professional development through interactions with excellent role models. All of these new teachers recognize how fortunate they are to be teaching at Dreher.

One of them commented, "At Dreher you feel welcome, you know that people care about your professional development . . . this is not the case at some other schools".

Changing Roles

The USC students benefit because it is a very accommodating, comfortable environment, and there is a sense that everyone at Dreher is dedicated to the students' professional development across all content areas. Attitudes toward the university person on campus are different when the student is placed in a PDS environment where everyone's goal is professional development. The university supervisor is the coach, the liaison, the mediator, etc., but does not carry the authority or "ivory tower" sort of image. The relationship is more congenial and conducive to good conversation with the students and the teachers. It takes about the same amount of time to supervise student teachers regardless of whether they are in a PDS or not. However, more time is spent by supervisors at Dreher because of the perks of camaraderie and connections with the faculty.

Future Goals

The development of this important partnership requires a continual commitment from both USC and Dreher. As Goodlad's fifteenth postulate states, "Programs for the education of educators must assure for each candidate the availability of a wide array of laboratory settings for observation, hands-on experiences, and exemplary schools for internship and residencies . . . " (Goodlad, 1990). Dreher, in only its first year as an official PDS site, is probably one of strongest professional development schools. However, there are many goals that we will strive for as we continue the partnership. These goals are described in the next few paragraphs.

The need for a strong infrastructure of support is a key component for the success of any PDS. Networks of people with expertise in the content areas, particularly in the arts and sciences, are critical for a high school PDS. There is a very strong need for an adjunct faculty member at Dreher to organize the activities of the USC students. Currently, teachers are being forced to use their planning period to arrange schedules and class visits for practicum students. Ms. Markham expressed her concerns, " . . . until there is somebody who is supported by USC and the school district with release time, we are going to begin losing communication and conversations."

In terms of research, we have only begun to tap into all of the possibilities. We realize the need for a structured research component, something longitudinal in nature that would allow us to look at the real benefits of a PDS for our students. The research that we are considering pertains to the macro-level of the PDS as a school. This type of research would involve USC and Dreher faculty and students.

There are fewer constraints in professional development schools. It is easier to take things directly from methods courses and apply them right away. This should open up opportunities for research. As we move further into inquiry approaches to best practice, the partnership will be of even more benefit to high school teachers and students as well as to our own faculty.

There has been much consideration given to how the secondary preparation program might change as a result of the partnership with Dreher. A department-wide focus on the PDS environment is needed because of the benefits to the school, USC, and our students. There could be a major research goal focusing on secondary PDSs. One question that could be addressed is, "What is the best way to maximize the partnership?" With longitudinal studies, we might pull in graduate students to help, making them better candidates and adding research to the clinical aspect of teacher preparation.

The USC-Dreher partnership, in some ways, is like a newborn child. It is an infant that is expected to be an adult. It must simultaneously learn to crawl, walk, talk, read, and do calculus. It typifies many school reform initiatives where one is not able to shut down to retool. Changes must take place even when old images, habits, and practices continue. Collaborative partners gradually learn to do business differently as they strive for educational excellence for all of our students. It is indeed a challenging and exciting time with unlimited opportunities.

References

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. Jossey-Bass, Inc.: San Francisco.

Holmes Group (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education*. Rockefeller Foundation: New York.

PORTRAIT OF A PARTNERSHIP:

DUMONT HIGH SCHOOL AND MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

By Jeffrey Scheetz, Dumont High School

Twelve years ago, Montclair State College, now Montclair State University, began a collaboration with five area public school districts through what was called the Clinical Schools Network. The purpose of these partnerships was to further the understanding of higher order thinking in the local schools, utilizing the student teaching experience as the vehicle to assist practicing educators to better understand the concept. Research conducted during that time indicated the presence of a mutual learning effect that occurred between student teachers and cooperating teachers specifically as it applied to the ability to infuse higher order thinking in the classroom. It was this finding that led one of the administrators in a partner school to conclude that the student teaching experience and related activities could serve as a meaningful approach to staff development. Thus began a journey that culminated in the creation of the first secondary partner school in the state of New Jersey.

As conservative institutions, schools are resistant to change. Many efforts toward meaningful school reform have been superficial in nature. In contrast, the following partner school portrait is designed to allow the reader a glimpse of the journey undertaken by educators from Dumont High School and Montclair State University to significantly alter the approach to teaching and learning that routinely occurs in most American schools. The portrait also describes Dumont High School's efforts to join with neighboring Paramus High School to create a regional partner school.

Dumont High School is a small, suburban school in northeast New Jersey, located approximately twenty minutes from New York City. Paramus High School is slightly larger and only ten minutes away from Dumont. Both schools enjoy good reputations and have expressed a desire to work together by combining program elements and sharing resources. Each school is at a different developmental stage in its partnership with Montclair State University.

The simple premise for the creation of the Dumont Partner School was that improved schools necessitated better-prepared teachers. That can only be achieved through the active participation of school-based personnel. The design of this new entity was based upon the four points of practice most commonly associated with professional development schools: improvement of instruction, on-site research, the professional development of current staff members, and the preparation of future teachers.

This partner school was to be jointly staffed by university and public school faculty who had the time, the freedom, and the places to plan and work together. The school's curriculum would reflect current thought and direction in the disciplines as well as overarching goals, such as higher order thinking. The creation of this partner school posed a number of unique challenges that will be discussed as this portrait unfolds.

The evolution of the partner school took place within the New Jersey Network for Educational Renewal, an entity that reflects the university's organizational framework for school-university partnerships. As the pooled human and material resources of the school and the university are invested in the partner school, the partners are better able to contribute to the simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education in New Jersey than they would working in isolation. Although the Dumont Partner School will become officially operational in the fall of 1997, many of the activities that are associated with such schools have gone forward a full year in advance of that date. At the very least, the school district, the university, and the Dumont Teachers' Association had addressed the kinds of preliminary issues upon which partner schools depend for their efficacy: a sense of mission, the establishment of parity and trust among the partners, and an exploration of the sources for the ongoing support of the school.

As a member of the NJNER, Dumont High School deepened its partnership with Montclair State University through a variety of Network activities. For example, through the student teaching experience, high school staff served as cooperating teachers as well as educational supervisors. Volunteer staff members gave their time to host MSU students during their initial field experiences. Among other activities, these teachers helped MSU students explore their reasons for entering the teaching profession. Dumont High School faculty also served on panels to offer expertise to preservice teachers as part of the culminating "Effective Teaching/Productive Learning" course taught at the school for three weeks by a professor from Montclair State. During the student teaching experience, bi-weekly seminars were conducted after school by high school staff to provide junior faculty members with the opportunity to discuss issues of pedagogy and classroom management. These seminars also have proven mutually beneficial to first- and second-year teachers who share many of the same questions and concerns as the junior faculty.

Dumont High School also began to conduct on-site research through the use of NJNER Renewal Grants in such areas as cultivating the self-directed learner, using scanners and the Internet to teach foreign languages and social studies, and creating portfolio assessment. These grants allowed teachers, supervisors, and administrators to conduct research that will lead to the improvement of teaching and learning.

As the partnership with MSU evolved, it became apparent that Dumont High School had in place many of the elements of a partner school. The mutual benefits accruing to Dumont High School and MSU in the area of preservice and inservice staff development made the transition to a

partner school seem very desirable. That goal, however, was not shared by everyone at the high school. Perhaps the principal's greatest challenge in that regard was to win the support of the local professional association, a critically important prospective stakeholder in the partner school. The NEA Teacher Education Initiative and the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) played a pivotal role, along with the Dumont Education Association (DEA), in the creation of the Dumont High Partner School.

In December 1995, the NJEA held a meeting of its Professional Development Committee. The principal of Dumont High School and the president of the Dumont Education Association were invited, as well as representatives of other NJNER schools and faculty and administrators from Montclair State University. The purpose of the meeting was to explore establishing a partner school in one of the Network schools where the NJEA was a majority representative. On that occasion, Nicholas Michelli, dean of the College of Education and Human Services at MSU, stressed the centrality of the partner school concept in the university's approach to educating future teachers. Dr. Michelli added that much of the university's work focused on the four dimensions of reform described in John Goodlad's work: (a) professional development to ensure equitable access to knowledge for all students; (b) stewardship or leadership by teachers in transforming schools and fostering best practice; (c) pedagogical nurturance through the creation of a safe environment for students; and (d) enculturation of young people with the knowledge and skills needed for democratic citizenship.

The president of the Dumont Education Association, a teacher at the high school, had both professional and personal questions about the partner school. She voiced concern as to the direction that the partnership with MSU was taking. The "turf" issues as expressed by the president concerned three main issues: (a) Who has the final say in determining the high school curriculum? (b) Who will determine which teaching and evaluation strategies to use in the high school's classrooms? and (c) Will university personnel have any input into the teacher observation and evaluation process?

These questions were among the many issues discussed at a March 1996 retreat attended by teachers, principals, superintendents, and board of education members from four schools in the NJNER who had expressed interest in the partner school concept. They were joined by faculty and administrators from Montclair State University and representatives from NJEA. Dumont and Paramus High School staffs were among the invited guests. Decisions were made at this retreat to attempt to establish an operational partner school and to form a steering committee to guide that work.

In many respects, this portrait focuses on the efforts of the principal of Dumont High School and the local association president to come to agreement on the conditions for establishing a partner school. In particular, it describes the experiences through which the Association president came to lend her support to the effort. It also touches on the related issue of regionalization with Paramus High School and its teachers' association.

If the president of the local teachers' association were to become a proponent of the partner school, she needed to develop her own understanding of the concept. To that end, she attended a conference in Kennebunkport, Maine, in September 1996. The conference, sponsored by the Teacher Education Initiative of the NEA, encouraged educators to discuss, dissect, and investigate the concept of a partner school. Upon her return to Dumont, the president expressed a very positive disposition towards the idea and its possible benefits for the staff and students of Dumont High School.

The Association president and the high school principal agreed to the formation of a partner school committee that would represent teachers from all the curricular areas. This was done in order to communicate to their mutual "clientele" the benefits of participation in a partner school. Both the principal and the president thought that ongoing communication would be essential if the partner school concept were to move forward. By design, therefore, the partner school committee consisted both of active members of the DEA and other faculty members who had been active in the work of the NJNER.

As informal discussions between the principals of Dumont and Paramus High Schools continued, a need to convene a formal stakeholder's meeting among the three potential partners became clear. Therefore, in October 1996, a one-day retreat involving personnel from Dumont and Paramus High Schools as well as administrators and faculty from MSU was conducted. The five principal areas of discussion were:

1. the context for the partner school project;
2. an operational definition of a partner school;
3. the needs, concerns, and questions raised in common by the participants with respect to the partner school concept;
4. the priorities which each stakeholder group identified with respect to the partner school concept;
5. the decisions which were collectively made by the participants with respect to subsequent activities.

A subsequent luncheon meeting with DEA building representatives and their president revealed that the following questions still needed to be answered by the principal and university administrators.

(a) How would any agreement between the school and the university affect the current teachers' contract?
(b) How would individual teachers' rights be protected?

(c) Will university staff be viewed by the high school administration as the "experts," thus minimizing teacher expertise?

(d) What additional benefits will accrue to the faculty and students of the high school by becoming a partner school?

In order to answer these questions, the Association president decided to observe and become more actively involved in Network activities that were similar to those of a partner school. Her first opportunity came when she was invited to speak with a class of MSU students who were taking a course at the high school entitled "Effective Teaching/ Productive Learning," a requirement before commencing their student teaching. Also involved in the dialogue were the superintendent of schools and the district's curriculum coordinator. The president became absorbed in these discussions with the preservice teachers and left the class wondering if perhaps she too had learned something about teaching from the experience.

A second opportunity for the president to observe the benefits of a partner school occurred when she sat in on luncheon workshops being presented by a MSU professor. This particular series of workshops concerned ways to help staff adjust to the requirements of a new bell schedule which extended periods by ten minutes but provided fewer meeting dates. She listened as faculty members discussed and exchanged information relative to solutions to the problem. After the third meeting, she began to participate in the discussions and found herself analyzing her own teaching methods and strategies. She took from these workshops new critical thinking activities to help her students learn to categorize and analyze information in a foreign language context. Slowly, she began to realize that participating in such seminars had practical advantages for her and her students.

On another occasion, the site coordinator for the NJNER was hosting an Initial Field Experience seminar for seven sophomores from MSU. This course initiated these students into many aspects of the profession that a teacher encounters on a daily basis. The president was invited to this session to discuss the Dumont Teachers' Association and why it exists. To her surprise, these students were very interested in the school's efforts to become a partner school and what role the Association would play. She explained that the Association's function would be to provide an atmosphere conducive to teacher training, staff development, and the enhancement of student learning. The president left the meeting with a heightened sense that she was helping these students to develop a deeper understanding of what it means to be a teacher.

Later that year, the president sat in on a meeting of the science department, which was also attended by several professors from MSU. She listened as her colleagues and the university faculty shared instructional strategies and other items of mutual interest. She observed her fellow teachers as they eagerly discussed opportunities being offered by the university professors, such as field trips to observe science labs at Montclair State, visits to the MSU computer lab to view curriculum-related

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

software, and the use of MSU science equipment at the high school. Once again, the president left the department meeting considering if such school-university partnerships could enhance student learning.

In February 1997, the president was chosen to be part of a five-member team that traveled to Phoenix, Arizona, to attend a national team meeting for all high schools participating in the Arthur Vining Davis Secondary Partner School Project. The other team members were the high school principal, a professor from MSU's College of Education and Human Services, a faculty member from the arts and sciences, and the curriculum coordinator from Paramus. It quickly became obvious that other states represented at the conference did not have the strong involvement of their teachers' associations as did the team from New Jersey. The president's attendance at the conference was viewed by many as somewhat of a novelty. She was repeatedly questioned by her colleagues from around the country as to how and why the Dumont and Paramus Education Associations were given such prominent roles in their schools' efforts to become a partner school.

A new theme discussed at the conference was that of the complexities of the change process in an educational setting. A partner school, the president learned, was not really a structure but rather more of a journey of constant renewal, changing and shifting its direction to meet the needs of its partners at any given time. The president now viewed the professors from MSU as her colleagues, not people who considered themselves superior to her because of their status in the educational hierarchy. Her opinions and expertise mattered to them so her feelings of value to the partner school endeavor continued to grow.

Upon her return home, the president drafted a document of assurance that the contractual rights and working conditions of every member of the Association would be protected and that their voices would be heard on any governance structure of the partner school. She then secured the approval of the NJEA field representative for the document and presented it to her Association building representatives. This Statement of Assurance was just the type of guarantee they were seeking in order to recommend the partner school concept to their constituents. Convinced that they could now "sell" the partnership to their colleagues, it was decided to put the issue to a formal vote in the spring.

The New Jersey State Department of Education, coincidentally, had been proposing new legislation that would require all public school teachers in the state to renew their teaching certificates every five years. Partner schools, referred to as professional development schools, were mentioned by name as a possible vehicle for satisfying such a requirement. With this information now available, the prospects of selling the partner school concept to the staff seemed better than ever.

In April 1997, the president was invited by the NEA to attend a meeting at Association headquarters in Washington, D.C. The purpose of the meeting was to meet with presidents and

Association field representatives from other states to share experiences, benefits, and problems related to partner schools. The issues and situations varied from state to state, but everyone agreed that partner schools gave the profession and the union an opportunity to put everyone in a better light with the public while advancing the profession. The NEA restated its support for any local association's efforts to form such a partnership.

At Dumont, before the faculty vote, a final meeting was scheduled to clarify last- minute issues between the Association representatives, partner school committee members, and university personnel. A significant outcome of this meeting was a request from the university to have the Association formulate a portrait of a University-Association-School Liaison. This portrait was written with input from all segments of the faculty. The portrait is one of an inclusive nature which could require more than one person to fit the description. It deals with such characteristics as a willingness to engage in dialogue on all issues; a respect for the equality, professionalism, and autonomy of all partners; and the acceptance of the need to continually evaluate the effectiveness of the project. This portrait is an obvious effort to encourage participation by a number of individuals in the partner school project. It met with the approval of university representatives. Thus, with all of the preliminary work completed, it was time for the faculty of Dumont High School to vote on its future.

A faculty meeting was held in May 1997, to which the dean of the College of Education and Human Services was invited as well as the Association's field representative. Both individuals addressed the faculty and restated their support for the partner school concept. Association building representatives then spoke about the possible benefits to be accrued through partnership with Montclair State University. They addressed issues such as the sanctity of the existing contract, the availability of graduate courses on site, and the creation of inservice workshops which could be helpful with the pending recertification initiative. With the endorsement of the Association, the membership voted 48-1 to become a partner school.

As the 1996-97 school year drew to a close, plans were made to celebrate Dumont High School's new status as a partner school the following fall. It was decided to conduct a formal signing ceremony involving representatives from the high school, district central office, university, and the Association. All faculty members of the high school would be invited as well as the press and NJEA staff.

All partners anticipate that those PDS activities in place before the signing ceremony will continue after the agreement has been formalized. A graduate course, "Innovations in Teaching," will be taught in the fall of 1997 by a university professor at Paramus High School. This course will be available to teachers from Paramus and Dumont as part of the PDS program. It is hoped that in time such courses can be team-taught with university and high school staff. Plans have also been discussed to link the three schools electronically to facilitate communication and provide more

opportunities for staff development. The four dimensions of reform, as stated earlier, will continue to guide the work of the PDS.

Plans are under way to revise the process by which student teachers are placed at Dumont High School by Montclair State University. It is anticipated that Dumont will be given the first selection of all student teachers in the pool of available students in a given semester. The partner schools have discussed the creation of several cohorts of university students, ranging from initial field students to student teachers, who will study both curriculum and methods courses at the high schools.

An early challenge for this new partner school will be to decide on a governance structure that will give all the concerned parties an equal voice. In turn, the ability of this group to communicate its decisions to its constituents in their respective institutions will significantly bear upon its success or failure. It is anticipated that the Dumont High School principal, Association president, and Site Coordinator, along with the MSU Liaison, will serve on the Governance Committee. When Paramus High School has officially become a PDS, a Regional Governance Committee will be created to include representatives from both high schools and Montclair State University. This group will decide, with input from their staffs, the nature of future PDS activities and the focus of staff development offerings.

Efforts to create a Regional Partner School with Paramus High School were dealt a setback in the fall of 1996 with the resignation of the Paramus principal. Although the momentum of the project slowed somewhat, the staff of Paramus High School has maintained its interest and its developmental work with MSU. When the Paramus staff is further along in the partner school process, regionalization talks will continue.

Lessons Learned

As a result of the events that will lead to the signing of an agreement between Montclair State University, the Dumont Education Association, and Dumont High School to create a partner school, several key lessons concerning the nature of educational change have evolved.

1. In states such as New Jersey with a strong collective bargaining history, the involvement of the local education association in any partnership for renewal is essential. Bringing it into the process at its inception has helped to limit the number of concerns regarding teachers' rights as protected by their contract. The support of Montclair State University for Dumont Education Association involvement has also been strong and constant. Treating the Association as an equal partner in the creation and governance of the partner school has

elevated the DEA's commitment to staff development and encouraged more teachers to become involved in the effort.

2. Teachers must be convinced of the benefits for themselves and their students if they are to willingly participate in partner school activities. Several months ago, the New Jersey Department of Education began to campaign for new regulations that would require all public school teachers in the state to renew their professional certificates every five years. In one of NJDOE's written statements, the concept of a partner school was discussed as a possible vehicle by which staff development requirements could be met. This exciting possibility gave impetus to Dumont's efforts and provided staff with a tangible reason to actively participate in staff development activities provided under the partner school umbrella.

3. The majority of teachers who supported the partner school concept did not necessarily do so initially to support the philosophy of simultaneous renewal. Their decision was based on more pragmatic issues such as recertification. The appeal of the Association to enlightened self-interest proved to be the most expeditious approach to securing the overwhelming support of the staff. It is hoped that, in time, all teachers will develop more of an appreciation for the benefits to their profession and students from partnership with the university.

4. As with most change efforts, the ability to communicate can only enhance a project's chances of success. Early in the process, those who supported the basic rationale for such a partnership were in a minority. They were perceived by some on the staff as elitists who were only interested in furthering their own careers and displaying little respect for their colleagues' professional opinions and skills. This misconception was due in part to a lack of communication between the education association and the NJNER. After several years of misunderstandings and failures to communicate, both parties realized that it was in their mutual interests to share information and provide honest, timely feedback to each other about what was being discussed by the faculty concerning the partner school and other NJNER activities.

5. An individual school's efforts to become a partner school cannot be successful without the tangible and visible support of the central office. Having a superintendent of schools who allows the building principal the freedom to pursue his vision and provides the resources to create it is critical to any such endeavor. Having stability in both leadership positions has

proven to be an asset in the evolution of the partner school concept. Conversely, the change in leadership at Paramus High School has delayed the adoption of the partner school concept in that building.

6. Efforts toward renewal can be adversely affected by clashes in personality, no matter how well intentioned the individuals involved may be. If the disagreements cannot be resolved, difficult decisions must be made so that the partner school project can move forward.

7. Creating a spirit of inquiry throughout the school can have a reinvigorating effect on teachers who have become conditioned to more traditional instructional strategies. It is possible to rekindle in these teachers the sense of moral purpose that brought them to education, provided they are given the time and resources to do so. This spirit of inquiry is contagious and can quickly transform the culture of a school.

8. Meaningful change within an educational setting takes time. If such reforms are to take hold and flourish, individuals must develop their own reasons for participating in those efforts and become change agents who actively support the concept and encourage others to join them. This process is best measured in years, not months.

9. Participants in a change project should not view the inevitable problems that occur when attempting to redefine the mission of a school as a negative or undesirable outcome. Such problems can lead to the forging of new and more productive relationships. An example of this lesson is the improved quality of the relationship that now exists between the high school principal and the president of the teachers' association.

Experiencing the Promise of Simultaneous Renewal: A Portrait of Madeira Junior/Senior High School

By D. J. Hammond and Robert Larbes, Madeira Junior/Senior High School, and Bernard J. Badiali, Miami University

This portrait holds to the proposition that, despite what one reads in the popular press, good things occur every day in high schools across the country. As resistant to change as high schools appear to be, activities that adhere to the highest principles of collaboration and partnership frequently take place; when these principles are enacted, the rewards for individuals and the school community are enormous. At Madeira Junior/Senior High School, there is substantial evidence that educational experiences for high school students, preservice teachers, veteran teachers, and college teachers have occurred. Simultaneous renewal is evident. The task before us is not increasing the quality of these experiences, but increasing the frequency and regularity of them.

There have been many fruitful partnership activities at Madeira High School during the last several years. Student interns have been placed as cohorts with teams of veteran teachers. Cooperating teachers have conducted weekly seminars for interns on relevant topics. Madeira staff have enrolled in on-site, cognitive coaching classes to enhance their skills in working with student interns. Teacher education faculty and Madeira staff have held conversations about expectations for field experiences, integrated curriculum, and the process of school change. Doctoral students have engaged with Madeira staff to address problems in curriculum, instruction, and leadership. Madeira faculty have acted as critical friends, advising doctoral students on the practicality of long-range plans and innovative practices. Professors and teachers have teamed up to conduct research on such topics as student learning, curriculum design, parental attitudes, and perceptions of student teachers. Collaborative activities have had promising results; many have led to renewal of teachers and professors alike. We believe that with continued support and leadership, activities such as those mentioned above will increase.

Preparing to write this portrait has led us to two fundamental conclusions. First, when professors, teachers, and students work together in partnership, everyone benefits. Second, the most important way to sustain a partnership is by winning the hearts and minds of those within it. Nothing sustains collaboration more than personal commitment. For these two reasons, the portrait begins with one experienced teacher's extended account of a successful teaming arrangement and the benefits of working on simultaneous renewal. Following the description on teaming are three personal vignettes of individuals involved in the partnership. These accounts are intended to illustrate attitudes and dispositions that come from working in a partnership high school. We made a conscious effort, given the space restrictions, to relate these stories in detail rather than try to provide brief descriptions of all of the partnership activities that occurred during the last four years.

The first story comes from a former intern and now second-year teacher at Madeira. Next, an experienced English teacher describes how her attitude and perspective about teacher education have changed. The third vignette comes from a university liaison to Madeira. The portrait concludes with the notion that Madeira has shown exemplary partner school characteristics, though not with the regularity it has the potential to demonstrate. Some people in the partner school have seen the "promised land" of simultaneous renewal, but wish to extend their view to colleagues. That is our vision.

Bob's Story: Teams in the Promised Land

The seventh-grade teaching team of which I was a member was excited about the concept of a professional development school. We knew, first hand, the benefits of working collaboratively and the challenges associated with coming together as individuals who had been "trained" in a traditional model of teaching. Near the end of the 1992-93 school year, we worked together with Miami University to create cohorts of student "interns" that would mirror the teams of seventh- and eighth-grade teachers. This resulted in eight teachers at each grade level working with approximately 210 students. It is interesting to look back on that initiative in terms of the "Characteristics of Successful Collaboration" as identified by Sharon P. Robinson and Linda Darling-Hammond in the book *Professional Development Schools* (1994): (1) mutual self-interest and common goals; (2) mutual trust and respect; (3) shared decision making; (4) a clear focus; (5) information sharing and communication; (6) fiscal support; (7) commitment from top leadership; (8) manageable agenda; (9) dynamic nature; and (10) long-term commitment.

From the beginning, we enjoyed a sense of mutual self-interest and common goals. All participants believed that they would become better at their practice individually, that they would grow as teams, and that the students would benefit from the experience. The cooperating teachers looked to the interns for energy, enthusiasm, and innovation. The interns looked to the cooperating teachers for guidance, experience, and understanding. The students would have more adults concerned about their progress, the opportunity to witness collaborative work, and exposure to some innovative activities. We genuinely believed that this structure would facilitate the creation of a culture of caring focused on the whole student while at the same time enhance learning in the subject areas.

Perhaps the key event in the entire practice occurred when the eight veteran teachers and the eight interns met for a day of planning and conversation before school began. Miami University's liaison designed the day and facilitated the activities. The building principal and the superintendent addressed the group, and both spoke of their interest, support, and enthusiasm for the initiative. The first group activity of the day would prove to be perhaps the most important. Each of the interns

interviewed one of the veteran teachers who was on a different team and who taught a different subject. The process was designed to create an awareness of common goals but, more importantly, to build the foundation of "trust and respect" that would be necessary during the next sixteen weeks.

From the start, each cooperating teacher made it clear that this endeavor was to be a shared one, with interns and staff acting as equals in terms of the value placed upon ideas, the need to participate fully, and the decision making that is such an intrinsic part of the "business" of school. This idea was echoed in the afternoon team meetings and was immediately a part of the way work was done. Trying to get sixteen people to agree on anything is challenging and the first decision may have been one of the more difficult ones faced during the semester–where to go for lunch. The process begun in the early hours of the collaboration would serve the teams well in every aspect of their work, be it the eighth-grade's planning and execution of a Civil War simulation, "Glory Days," or the seventh-grade's development of a series of curricular informational nights for parents. It was obvious from the outset that all eight teachers were equal partners, sharing both the fame and the blame. Three years later, one of the seventh-grade interns stated, "I felt like a teacher from day one." Shared decision making was evident during the daily team planning period and also during the individual planning time when an intern and a cooperating teacher planned for and reflected upon their classes.

The teams did have a clear focus that was reinforced on a daily basis during team planning. This focus began to emerge during that initial meeting in August and guided the eighth-grade team through its efforts to encourage students to understand and demonstrate the fourteen characteristics of intelligent behavior. Our seventh grade was driven by its focus on the importance of helping students develop respect and responsibility for themselves and others. To make sure that we kept our focus, the seventh-grade team set aside Friday's team planning time to share journals we had written on a variety of topics selected by each teacher in turn. Writing about and sharing topics, such as the role of Miss Caroline in *To Kill a Mockingbird* and "the worst grade you ever got," kept the team focused on the fact that it was made up of individuals with much in common and much to offer.

Information sharing and communication were essential to the teams' efforts. Without the time (team and individual planning periods) and the realization that everyone must participate fully for the teams to succeed, little of consequence would have been achieved. Information was shared in many ways and to a degree that was remarkable for our high school. It was shared between teachers and students, among teachers, between teachers and parents, and between teachers and administrators. This communication required thoughtfulness and energy on the part of teachers in ways never before experienced.

Some of our initiatives required additional financial support. Projects such as the seventh grade's creation of different biomes in the four homerooms consumed large amounts of supplies and materials from the art department. Teachers working in concert wanted to provide meaningful

experiences for students outside of school which stretched the field trip budget, and so on. Teachers and students worked together and our fund-raising activities became another source of creative problem solving and cohesiveness.

Both teams took great pains to make sure that they did not attempt to do too much in terms of projects and activities which could possibly detract from Madeira's academic emphasis. To accomplish this, the teams limited themselves to no more than a single inter/multidisciplinary event each quarter. However, there was daily and weekly collaboration and sharing of time and resources, with serious effort made to overlap and reference learning whenever possible.

One of the true joys of the experience for some and frustration for others was the fact that plans, issues, and ideas were constantly being redesigned. This was due in large part to reflection on practice becoming an integral part of each team's culture. Our experience and the evolving understanding as to what happened has caused the partnership and subsequent intern placements to be rethought and continuously reconfigured. There is, however, a strong belief that this semester was the best idea we have had in terms of substantive change in teacher education.

Initially, the project had the support of the superintendent, the Board of Education, and the principal. As time passed and concerns rose, much of that support eroded. There were a number of issues raised, some of which are probably inherent to any student intern placement. Some of them were magnified by at least a factor of eight. A handful of parents became concerned as to whether or not their children would go through an entire day and never have a "real" teacher. Pressure was applied to board members, administrators, and teachers. By the end of the semester, it was obvious to all that despite the fact that students, teachers, interns, and most parents (as discovered through surveys) were enthusiastic about the experience, it would not be immediately repeated. We came to realize that continued communication and "education" of the parents and community is essential. They, too, must be involved in simultaneous renewal.

As members of partner teams, we look to the future with a few battle scars but undaunted in spirit. We have come to realize that clear answers are not always possible and that "ambiguity is the warp of life, not something to be eliminated" (Bateson, 1994, p. 9). This journey has taught us much, we have seen success, and we will continue to find the best possible expression of "partnership" for Madeira and Miami.

Paula's Story: Simultaneous Teaching and Learning Using Reflective Journals

From my friends at Miami, I had heard a variety of tales as they were assigned to schools for their interning experience. Some interns were pretty much left on their own; others struggled under the continuous direction of a cooperating teacher who seemed determined to clone herself. At Madeira, as a member of a team of student teachers working with an existing teaching team, I

experienced daily interaction with four veteran teachers and four other interns like myself. Throughout the semester, I grew not only as a classroom teacher but also as a person. This progress was the result of dedicated commitment that members of the team made to their careers, to each other, and to the kids.

One method the team utilized for professional growth was team journal sharing. Every Monday a topic would be generated and on Friday we read our individual responses. Some journal entries would evoke laughter, some silent understanding, and some would create tears. Using this journal, I can look back on my student teaching experience now and see the benefit to the students, to teachers, and to myself.

The team-within-a-team experience benefited the students of Madeira in many ways; one of the most obvious was to lower the teacher-to-student ratio in the classroom. We were able to focus on individual students and share our concerns during the daily team meetings as well as in our journals. I had talked with Heather, another intern, about a student named Mike whom I was afraid was being labeled as a discipline problem without being given a fair chance. A portion of a journal entry reflects my growing insights into the complexities of teaching:

> I shared my thoughts during a team meeting when we were discussing how students can be mirrors (to either ourselves in the past or now). As a team, we realized that everyone will connect with different students. I realized a valuable asset of the team is that through individual teachers, individual students will be better understood and no one will be lost in the cracks.

The journal further reflects the benefits that the individuals on the team received from each other. One week's entry challenged us to observe another member of the team and reflect upon why this person was a good teacher. As I watched Bob, I realized that:

> Perhaps his attraction is that he is unpredictable. The students tend to follow him with their eyes for fear they might miss something. Most importantly, Bob is himself. He doesn't put on a teacher personality to hide who he really is. His anecdotes allow the children to envision him as a father, team member, and friend.

The journal entries were shared and tears were shed that day. Most unique was that the interns were described (by the veteran teachers) as teachers too; we were all equals.

When a job became available at Madeira, I had an entire team to use as references; I was hired as a full-time teacher. Reading this journal three years later, I feel the overriding benefit was that we were simultaneously learning and growing. "The number of years of teaching experience

that surrounds me is probably more years than I've been in school–yet we all face the same dilemmas of planning, grading, and guiding." The team of interns and the team of teachers blended together for one semester and resulted in a far quicker understanding of teaching as a profession for me than I could have received in a year by myself. In one of John Goodlad's postulates, he underscores the necessity of programs which foster the socialization process through which candidates transcend their self-oriented student preoccupations in order to identify with the culture of teaching (Goodlad, 1994). I witnessed that success. "I've also reaffirmed my thought that team teaching, as we do it, is the most caring way to educate. I appreciate working in a school and with people where we all learn together as we grow."

D. J.'s Story: Looking Inward

I've come to love Oprah. It's not just that she refuses to peddle sleaziness on the television at 4:00 p.m.; rather, it's because she has been able to create a "culture" of reading across the nation with her monthly book choices and televised dinners with the author and selected readers. As a high school English teacher, I wish that all of my students would become habitual readers and writers, developing the habits of inquiry and reflection that will serve them well throughout their lives.

John Goodlad asserts that "the concept of being a lifelong learner should be a part of the socialization process from the outset" (1994, p. 62). Reading and the accompanying discussion should be the norm in schools. Beginning teachers need to be immersed in exemplary schools, those that utilize best practices to educate all the children and that develop a strong sense of professionalism in teachers and administrators (Goodlad, 1994).

In that respect, I'm lucky. The students at Madeira enjoy a lot of success: they routinely score among the top in the state on the Ohio Proficiency Tests; 90 percent go on to college; the school has won various national and state awards. The suburban community, for the most part, trusts and supports the schools, and employees are treated as professionals. However, we know that this success is not a destination at which we have arrived; there are a lot of schools which were "once good."

Ironically, our achievements sometimes hinder us. The old adage "if it's not broke . . . " can become a reason for complacency. Teaching is a consuming and sometimes isolating activity, yet the partnership with Miami University has helped us to become and to remain a good school, the kind of place where I am happy to send my own children. Though our school is rather small (approximately 690 students in grades 7 through 12), our faculty have been active in a variety of groups that are studying and revamping the coursework and requirements at the university level. Faculty members from Miami come to our campus to share concerns and ideas. The greatest value of these activities is that they give us a vehicle, a reason to continually come together and ask ourselves two crucial

questions: "What is the purpose of an education at Madeira High School?" and "How can we best enhance student learning?"

Though there are many stories of professional growth as a result of our collaboration, my own centers on a class in cognitive coaching taught several times on Madeira's campus by our Miami liaison. Previously, I had never wanted a student teacher in my room. The universities got all the money and I got the work of another "student." Ground down by a sense of duty, I had accepted a few, yet I always felt inadequate to the task. Was I giving them too much direction? Not enough? Was I shirking my primary responsibility: the education of my high school students?

Since the class was taught at Madeira, the room was full of my colleagues, people I have passed in the halls for years. Yet, as weeks went by, there was, for all of us, an increased camaraderie and a willingness to share not commonly found in high school. As we read about and discussed ways to help preservice teachers develop the cognitive complexity necessary to be an effective classroom teacher in a multitude of settings, we were nudged, even forced, to look at our own practices and beliefs, for we could not create a environment of professionalism for student teachers if we ourselves did not enjoy one. This self-critical glimpse led me to explore my own practices and beliefs about learning. I came to realize that working with a student teacher, especially in a team setting, would foster my own self-interests and benefit the learning of my students. Rather than worrying about passing on a canon of knowledge or a bag of tricks to an intern, together we would create a collaboration based on inquiry: student teaching as informed and thoughtful problem solving. I finally began to feel equipped to enthusiastically welcome a student teacher into my classroom and school, believing that the presence of another emerging professional in the room will be a positive experience for everyone.

Our challenge at Madeira is to maintain and create vehicles that will facilitate serious study and discussion among the faculty. Unlike Oprah, we have neither the budget nor the clout to get Toni Morrison to come to dinner and engage in conversation. Late afternoon teachers' meetings occasionally still collapse into a harangue against hats in school and the epidemic of restroom smokers. Yet, through the partnership with Miami and the Institute for Educational Renewal, we have had the opportunities to witness successes such as the cognitive coaching class. We have felt the energy generated when we meet in committees and teams and departments and discuss the underlying purposes and consequences of our assessments, curricula, and practices. We have witnessed the benefits and the increased learning for our students.

Renewal does not have to come in the dramatic metamorphosis of altered bell schedules or shifted classroom walls or encompassing inservice programs. Bateson (1994, p. 6) assures us that "sometimes change is directly visible, but sometimes it is apparent only to peripheral vision, altering the meaning of the foreground." As Madeira and Miami both struggle with questions of purposes and

means, I have come to appreciate the tensions and diversity of interpretations that make it clear that schooling will always be a work in progress and that we must all be observant and lifelong learners.

Bernard's Story: Witnessing Connections

I have spent about half of my twenty-five years in education teaching in high schools and the other half teaching in colleges. I believe I understand the similarities and differences between the two. My experience has helped me to understand why the two remain separate and why that separation works to the detriment of both. Pulling high schools and colleges closer together in collaborative partnerships might have the greatest unrealized potential of any approach to educational reform I know. There is no limit to what high school practitioners and professors can do when they agree on a common direction. That is why I chose to work at a university like Miami where partnerships are valued and supported. And that is initially why I have worked with Madeira High School to form a partnership built on mutual trust and equitable collaboration for the purpose of educational renewal. I say "initially" because at first it was the idea of partnership and its potential that drew me, but later the reason for working with Madeira has been the professional and personal relationships that I have formed there.

In 1993, I became the university liaison to Madeira High School. If a partnership is, as Clark suggests, a deliberately designed, collaborative arrangement between schools and universities working together to advance self-interests and solve common problems, then liaisons were to exercise some degree of leadership, mobilizing professors and teachers to work more closely toward common ends. Liaisons were to be the individuals who could describe and explain the culture of each school to university professors and who could negotiate what individual partners needed to become "renewing" schools. Liaisons were to represent Miami's School of Education and Allied Professions to teachers and administrators, to work closely with staff development, to assist with the placement of preservice teachers, and to be the linchpins to the partnership (Herman, Dowhower, Killian, and Badiali, 1994).

The reasoning behind the creation of liaison was simple. If partnership means working together equitably and respectfully, getting to know a school setting and culture would require more than an occasional visit by a university professor. As a new faculty member, I was only too glad to be selected as a liaison to Madeira, a high school in suburban Cincinnati. Interestingly, the school appeared to have many characteristics in common with Miami. It had a tradition for academic excellence, a supportive (albeit conservative) community, and a group of progressive teachers interested in serving students more thoughtfully. The attributes necessary for renewal were evident the first day I went into the building: struggle and equilibrium.

I spent substantial time each semester engaged in liaison activities. At the same time, I was responsible for teaching two graduate courses in curriculum and leadership. Eventually, those courses were redesigned to incorporate what I learned from the partner site. Since many of the courses focused upon school reform, I was able to engage my graduate students in the partner school where they, along with the teachers, conducted inquiry, wrote case studies, and took a team approach to mutual renewal (Badiali, 1995). Together, partnership teachers, administrators, and university colleagues decided to place student teaching cohorts in teams to work with teams of veterans. At the same time a group of teachers was engaged in renewing their practice, I was engaged in changing my graduate course to reflect more of what I saw in the partner school. On good days, observers could actually see mutual renewal the way it is described in the literature (Goodlad, 1994).

Besides the team-on-team student teaching arrangement, the richest experiences occurred when graduate students exhibited their learning for partner school teachers and university professors. For example, a team of doctoral students redesigned the partner school curriculum in an advanced seminar. They worked on solving the problems that discipline-based, fractionalized high school curricula present. Their task was similar to the task teachers faced in reality, but the seminar allowed for a safe simulation. After weeks of work, students presented their solution to an audience composed of teachers, administrators, and professors. They were careful not to suggest that their solution was "the" solution, but rather simply one solution to the problem of moving to curriculum integration. Teachers responded to graduate students, professors responded to teachers (actually, professors responded substantially to one another), administrators responded to professors, etc. Struggle ensued in a safe place; cross-cultural understanding grew, positions changed, and individuals left energized by new possibilities. Now it is common practice for graduate students to work with teachers on problems and dilemmas that come directly from the partner school setting. The solutions are not as important as the conversations that result from exhibiting them to a mixed audience.

I would like to relate two important lessons learned from the role of liaison. First, schools are at their best when they are sites of struggle (struggle with ideas and concepts, not struggle with one another). The equilibrium or self-portrait of schools must be disturbed in incremental and respectful ways. Fullan (1993) argues this point rather strongly: "Today, the teacher who works for or allows the status quo is the traitor." A renewing school is one in which ideological, pedagogical, political, moral, and ethical issues are part of a continuing conversation that eventually intertwines with action. Perhaps a renewing school can be identified by the extent to which such struggle exists around issues that disturb the balance, disrupt the equilibrium. Miami University's School of Education and Allied Professions is a renewing school. Having been part of the conversation for the past four years, I have been in a position to feel the struggle, to take part in disturbing the equilibrium

and, on some occasions, to wish that the struggle would cease. Then I realize that to struggle together with my colleagues about the purpose of public schools, about conflicting ideas and concepts, about logistics and routines, even about the form and structure of the partnership is at the very heart of educational renewal, and I am grateful to be in a setting where such struggle occurs openly. I am convinced that the struggle will result in better education for children, more powerful professional growth for teachers and professors, and more democratic schools.

Second, it occurs to me now that educational renewal is more than re-engineering existing relationships between schools and universities. It is more than closing the conceptual and cultural gaps between two very different enterprises–universities and public schools. Renewal begins with coming to terms about the purpose public schools should serve in society. Renewal needs to be regarded as means to certain ends, not an end in itself. Coming to an agreement about the "ends" of schooling is vital as we engage in activities together–otherwise, those of us who are trying to facilitate simultaneous renewal quickly find ourselves at cross purposes. This fact has not always been part of my thinking. There was a time when I believed that if we could improve the skills of teachers and administrators, schools would take care of themselves. But that is as naive as thinking that if I just take care of my house, the neighborhood will take care of itself. What I have come to realize is that there must be an overriding purpose. Staff development for what? Best practices for what? Working closer together for what? Often we hear the standard answer–for children. That is a good answer, but it begs the big question about purpose. The purpose of public schools in America is to enculturate the young into a democratic way of life, to prepare them for responsible citizenship. Democracy, then, is at the heart of renewal.

The Institute for Educational Renewal has been the catalyst for significant educational transformation at Miami. It has been durable despite wrenching changes in leadership since 1992. Two university presidents have come and gone as well as deans, one provost, numerous faculty, several partner school principals, and two superintendents. In times of leadership transition, there seems to be a push to return to the security of more peaceful times (less risky business, what we know how to do best). Unlike many change initiatives, however, the Institute for Educational Renewal has held its ground, evidence to me that the concept of educational renewal through partnerships can be an enduring one.

Madeira High School has engaged in exemplary partnership practices, the promised land of simultaneous renewal. The key to sustaining partnerships is winning hearts and minds. People must come first and innovations second. Our collaboration and teaming have been powerful and our personal stories are a reflection of that progress. We need to widen the circle of commitment that will allow exemplary practices to become more frequent and the passion which renewal generates to become commonplace.

Epilogue: As Far As the Eye Can See

In 1979, Madeira High School graduate David Brill hiked the 2,100-mile Appalachian Trail, reaching the peak of Mount Katahdin on September 27. The title of his book about the trek, *As Far As the Eye Can See*, captures the essence of our teams-with-teams initiative and the partnership with Miami as a whole. The point is that when embarking on such a journey, be it hiking from Georgia to Maine or trying to redesign the teacher education program of a major university, those making the journey go only "as far as the eye can see" and then look again. When travailing uphill through the Smoky Mountains, one cannot cover much ground or see very far. When two teachers are in the middle of a lesson that seems to have missed the point, they are not covering much ground and cannot see beyond the end of the period. The point is to keep moving, to keep seeking the horizon no matter how limited it appears. While climbing to the summit of Mount Katahdin, David Brill reflected that "I soon found myself so thoroughly absorbed in a tangle of conflicting emotions that I felt I was climbing alone when, in fact, I was surrounded by companions." He understands that without those companions he would not have reached his goal. That is the essence of partnership. It matters not that seated atop the peak he realized that "there were so many things to say, yet none of them could be articulated." Those of us who are involved in the partnership are nowhere near the summit of our endeavor and find articulation difficult. We can see further than before but not as far as we desire. Perhaps some day we will indeed have traveled "as far as the eye can see" and be able to answer the question posed by Terry and Renny Russell's book, *On the Loose*:

On the Loose

So why do we do it ?
What good is it ?
Does it teach you anything?
Like determination?
Invention?
Improvisation?
Foresight?
Hindsight?
Love?
Music?
Art?
Religion?
Strength or patience or accuracy or quickness or tolerance
or which wood will burn and how long is a day and how far is
a mile and how delicious is water and smoky green pea soup?
And how to rely on yourself?

References

Badiali, B. J. (1995). School-University Partnerships: Opportunities for Leadership. *Ohio Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Journal, 2,* 33-37.

Bateson, M. C. (1994). *Peripheral Visions: Learning Along the Way.* New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Darling-Hammond, L., Ed. (1994). *Professional Development Schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform.* London: The Falmer Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Herman, S., Dowhower, S., Killian, D., & Badiali, B. (1994). Liaisons: A Journey in Nurturing University-School Partnerships. *Record in Educational Leadership,* 14, 63-66.

Russell, T., & Russell, R. (1967). *On the Loose.* San Francisco: The Sierra Club.

PORTRAIT OF THE NORTHGLENN HIGH SCHOOL/ UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT DENVER PARTNERSHIP

By Deborah Arrowsmith, University of Colorado at Denver, and Rich Schweissing, Northglenn High School

The partnership between Northglenn High School (NGHS) and the School of Education (SOE) at the University of Colorado at Denver (UCD) began modestly in the fall of 1994 with the placement of a few teacher candidates (TCs) in math and science classrooms. The development of the partnership began to make rapid strides the following year when dramatic shifts in commitments on the part of Northglenn High School opened up new opportunities for school renewal.

The initial structure for the partnership relationship was conceived by the SOE when its Initial Teacher Education program was restructured, changing the university's teacher training philosophy and program. This occurred prior to any partnership negotiations with public schools. UCD's Initial Teacher Education program philosophically adopted the framework defined by John Goodlad in his book, *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*. The SOE developed criteria in order to find elementary and secondary schools willing to change not only the way they interacted with preservice teachers but were also willing to examine other aspects of the educational process (i.e., curriculum and instruction, professional development, inquiry).

The selection of NGHS was initiated for very pragmatic reasons. A CONNECT Grant for math and science had already linked Northglenn with UCD. As a result, placing the first teacher candidates in classrooms where these connections already existed was relatively easy.

NGHS is a suburban high school with a long tradition of academic excellence delivered in traditional patterns by an overwhelming percentage of senior staff members. The UCD/NGHS partnership began at the same time the school district changed to the middle school concept, resulting in NGHS becoming a four-year high school with a staff that grew by a third. Another external influence that collided with these changes were the curricular standards instituted by the state of Colorado. In addition, the community served by the school has become increasingly diverse, both ethnically and economically. Students come from federally subsidized housing, mobile homes, apartments, and single family dwellings. The district's English as a Second Language program is now housed at Northglenn. Clearly, rapid changes were taking place in curriculum, staff, and students simultaneously and it became clear to many on the staff that some rational process needed to be devised and implemented in order to assure that the standards of academic excellence, for which Northglenn has been noted, were not compromised.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It would be nice to be able say that the school entered into the partnership with a clear plan of how it would use the partnership to address the issues it was facing, with clear goals of what it expected to achieve. That is, however, not the case. When the partnership expanded in the second year from math and science into all five content areas in which UCD licenses teachers (English, foreign language, social studies, math and science), it began to explore ways to develop the other three functions of professional development schools (professional development, research and inquiry, and curriculum and instruction). In the process, many corners were turned without the leadership in the building fully knowing what would be the next step.

Adding another dimension to the partnership was the introduction of conversations with the UCD College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS). The Goodlad model for partner schools incorporates a three-way relationship between SOE, CLAS, and the public school. It quickly became apparent that the arts and sciences involvement was a necessary component if Northglenn was to be empowered to continue developing in the areas of curriculum and professional development. Adding CLAS to the mix also introduced a different twist to the partnership. At UCD, CLAS is primarily an undergraduate program, while the School of Education is strictly a graduate program. Structures and frameworks needed to be put into place that enabled these two entities to develop cooperative and mutually productive ventures in the area of teacher training.

As the partnership at Northglenn expanded from solely a teacher training relationship into curricular change and professional development, it became increasingly difficult to define partnership functions separately from other day-to-day functions of the school. In fact, the leadership in the building has consciously worked toward "institutionalizing" the partnership so that it is an integral part of Northglenn's business. Northglenn High School functions and the functions of the partnership have merged and are becoming complimentary of one another's goals and future directions. The "running" of Northglenn and the day-to-day "running" of the partnership are not separate business functions but rather an interwoven tapestry.

Teacher training was not only the first of the four functions to be instituted at NGHS; it is the cornerstone and driving force for other school renewal directions and focus. Teacher training is used as a tool to creatively finance other renewal activities. The impetus for looking for alternative financing came with the realization that there was a potential that Northglenn would house as many as thirty teacher candidates at any given time. This presupposed a need to place someone in charge of supervising the teacher training component with the building, maintaining communication links across partnership roles, and thinking about how to develop the other three Goodlad functions.

A financial arrangement was worked out involving both the school district and UCD with the approval of the teachers' union. Current district policy charges buildings the cost of an average teacher salary for each teacher assigned to the building regardless of a specific teacher's placement on the salary schedule. This average salary is almost double a beginning teacher's salary. Taking one

teacher salary from a vacancy, two interns were hired: one to fill the vacancy and one to fill a vacancy created by a master teacher selected to supervise the teacher training program. This individual became known as the Site Coordinator (SC). Interns were students selected from the teacher training program who had become fully licensed by the state of Colorado at Northglenn the previous year.

The site coordinator/intern arrangement is a win-win situation. The partnership has a full-time master teacher on site guiding the partnership by supporting teacher candidates as well as their clinical teachers (CTs). While the interns receive about $4,000 less than other first-year teachers and have only a one-year position, they receive other tangible and intangible benefits. Those who have finished the licensure program at UCD must complete an additional ten hours to receive their MA in education. Interns receive six hours of tuition waivers for accepting an intern position, worth about $1,200. Interviews with interns revealed the primary reasons for accepting a first-year teaching position for less pay to be: 1) many of the interns already had relationships with staff members who were available for mentoring; 2) they had familiarity with the students and school policies and procedures; and 3) they would receive continued support from the site coordinator and the university professors assigned to Northglenn.

UCD's initial teacher training program itself has a different philosophy and takes a different approach from traditional student teacher models. Because UCD concentrates a large number of teacher candidates at Northglenn, it is also able to provide resources in the form of professors in the school. One lead professor and one to two other professors, based on the number of teacher candidates in the building, are scheduled to be at Northglenn one day each week. Their initial role assumed in the building was primarily to supervise the teacher candidates. However, because of the frequency of their visits, they also develop relationships with the clinical teachers as well. The result in many cases has been true simultaneous renewal. Clinical teachers in the building learned or revived long-discarded teaching strategies, revitalizing their approach to the classroom. Professors teaching methods classes concurrent with the teacher candidates' experiences in the classrooms have revised assignments to address the more practical issues of day-to-day teaching. The teacher candidates and students at NGHS become the ultimate winners: TCs because their university classes and student teaching have a higher degree of congruency; students because they enjoy the energy and innovative teaching strategies of their preservice teachers, therefore providing students with more variety in their learning.

A key concern and issue identified early on was the possible community reaction to the number of teacher candidates students would encounter across their courses and throughout the academic year. This issue was addressed by introducing and utilizing the concept of co-teaching. For teachers long accustomed to closing their doors and being the sole "actor on stage," this was a major adjustment. It was also an adjustment to recognize that having a student teacher no longer

meant a week or two of modeling various teaching practices and then adjourning to the teachers' lounge while the student teacher "learned" how to teach, with occasional observations offered as advice by the clinical teachers. Co-teaching required that the clinical teacher and the teacher candidate co-planned and co-taught in the classroom. While a variety of models have emerged, the perception by students and parents alike is that students receive more individual attention than can possibly occur with a single teacher and, thus, students' educational opportunities improved. Further, while teacher candidates will have "solo" time of one to three weeks, the benefit of co-teaching allows them to develop solid teaching practices while their clinical teacher models strategies. Teacher candidates also received daily constructive feedback in the form of coaching. The overall experience for everyone involved was a marked improvement over the traditional "sink or swim" method.

UCD's initial teacher training model also created professional development opportunities not previously available to a school with limited funds for inservice. Because of the large numbers of teacher candidates in the building, multiple teachers with common needs could be released from the classroom for partial or full day to do other planning or curriculum work while their student teachers taught the classes. While many of these opportunities were created, the negative impact on student learning was minimal because of the co-teaching model. This marked the catalyst and the beginning of the partnership's significant role in professional development.

As curricular and professional development began to take on more focus as a part of the partnership functions, two things became apparent. First, anything that would be effective and worth doing would be too big a task for the site coordinator, who was already managing the teacher training component and maintaining university contacts. Furthermore, the position required different curricular and professional development skills. Consequently, the third year of the partnership began with the addition of a second site coordinator.

This was also the year that technology began to have a major impact on the curriculum. Northglenn, for the first time, enjoyed Internet access in multiple computer labs, but very few staff members believed they were competent to use this resource with their students. The new site coordinator had extensive technology credentials and recognition as a master teacher. Her co-teaching with classroom teachers quickly moved many teachers along a continuum toward competency and confidence in the computer labs. This was augmented by teacher candidates, many of whom came to the school with computer expertise.

The delivery of new curriculum also received major boosts from resources created by the use of interns and the partnership. The science department developed a new freshman course to assure the success of their students on the standards tests. Without a text available to address the comprehensive nature of the course, materials had to be created by the teacher, and labs and equipment had to be coordinated. A lead teacher was given a one-period class release in order to

coordinate the course's implementation. At the same time, a comprehensive remedial reading program was also instituted, requiring extensive planning and coordination. Again, a lead teacher was released for one period to assure the success of the program. While the jury is still out on the success of the science initiative (students will not be taking the standards tests until after their second year in the program), the reading program resulted in an average of a 1.9 grade level increase among students who have experienced reading failure throughout their school career.

At the other end of the achievement spectrum, UCD introduced their "Silver and Gold" program to NGHS. While not a new program for the University, the partnership was instrumental in opening the communication that made this opportunity possible. The Silver and Gold program had established criteria for certain courses. Courses already taught at Northglenn meeting that criteria became eligible, if the instructors themselves also met certain University criteria. Students could receive both college and high school credit concurrently for those courses accepted into the Silver and Gold program. Humanities and certain sections of American History were accepted the first year, and the program will continue to expand across other courses at NGHS.

While the Silver and Gold program has a long-standing prescribed curriculum, the concept has resulted in more curricular discussions between CLAS and NGHS. A desire to communicate between specific departments in order to examine the content standards may result in a "seamless curriculum" between Northglenn and UCD's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Those courses that match the criteria for their college counterparts would provide high school students college credit for a specific college course. An example might be an upper level foreign language course that could be identified as comparable to a particular level of the same language course at UCD. The most difficult impediments to making this happen is the time involved and the logistics of getting the right people working together.

While not directly related to the four functions, other connections have been made between the School of Education and Northglenn. When many changes began to take place as a result of the partnership, it became increasingly apparent across the schools partnered with UCD that there was duplication of effort. Further, there was not always congruence between partner school efforts and the efforts of the School Improvement Teams, which are mandated by the state legislature and include representatives of the community, members of the faculty, and students. The Associate Dean of Teacher Education acquired a small grant that provided for leadership teams from each partner school to meet throughout the year in a Leadership Academy led by the School of Education's dean. The Academy provided a framework to help schools organize so that goals of the partnership complemented the School Improvement Team goals. The key outcome of the Academy was that the efforts of the partnership have become even more closely integrated with the total operation of NGHS.

A second outcome of the Leadership Academy was a chance discussion of a serious need to evaluate the committee governance structure at NGHS. Decisions relative to policy, hiring, curriculum, and allocation of resources have been achieved through a shared decision-making model that involves administration, teaching staff, and support personnel. Committees to accomplish this have traditionally been created as need arose, resulting in confusion and overlap in some decision making, gaps, and decisions made on a crisis basis. Because the dean of School of Education had been working on a planning framework to address just this kind of problem, there was now an opportunity to try it out in a real situation. This kind of a connection would not have happened without the existence of the partnership and without key individuals working toward increasing communication so that all participants could understand the needs and goals of each partnership member.

By mid-year, a Leadership Coordinating Team of representative faculty was created who met with the dean to discuss the framework and plan for a total evaluation of the governance at NGHS. Working through the year, the framework took on a life of its own as the Leadership Coordinating Team sought to involve literally every member of the staff in evaluating what changes needed to be made so that the lines of communication between committees were clear and gaps in the decision-making process were eliminated. The partnership grew beyond anyone's initial vision. The evaluation process that took place at NGHS was considered so successful that it is now being disseminated throughout the school district with the help of the dean of the School of Education.

While the partnership has been viewed largely as a positive influence on Northglenn, it is neither problem nor conflict free. Thus far, however, the conflicts and problems that have arisen have also served to move the partnership forward. Collaborative and innovative solutions and ideas have further cemented working relationships and have provided platforms for new challenges.

Because UCD prepares and licenses teachers in five content areas (math, science, social studies, English, and foreign languages), teacher candidates are placed only in those classrooms at Northglenn High School. However, because of the philosophical underpinnings of the program and UCD's perspective as to what kinds of school experiences best prepare a well-rounded teacher, teacher candidates are involved in a multitude of activities, committees, and school functions; they are not merely assigned to one classroom. Consequently, they are extremely visible and their presence is well known at NGHS. Teacher candidates' clinical teachers are sometimes released from a partial or a full day of teaching in order to attend various functions related to the partnership. The partnership itself, because of the selective placement of the teacher candidates, quickly became viewed as something only a privileged few were in a position to benefit from it. Several informational and brainstorming sessions were held throughout the year by the site coordinator, UCD professors working at Northglenn, and building administrators. Those participating directly in various aspects of the partnership (e.g., teachers serving as clinical teachers, individuals receiving reduced UCD tuition,

release time for university-sponsored workshops and meetings, etc.) as well as those who were not active participants were invited to attend. The intention was to brainstorm ways to include anyone interested in participating in and benefiting from the partnership. One such session was held near the end of the 1996-97 school year. Participants generated strategies by which everyone at NGHS–those with teacher candidates as well as those without–could participate in and benefit from the UCD/NGHS partnership.

Another area of concern was how to evaluate a professor's work in partner schools. The current policies and standards for professors revolve around fundamentally different professional activities than those typically engaged in by professors working with partner schools. The administration and other key individuals at Northglenn have been instrumental in working with the university and the professors themselves in order to realign evaluation with the reality of partner school work.

Another issue addressed was how to accommodate the large numbers of teacher candidates in the five content areas rotating in and out of Northglenn and not suffer from "clinical teacher burnout." Some clinical teachers, especially within certain departments (e.g., social studies), were mentoring teacher candidates semester after semester, year after year. The question became: How do we accommodate all of the TCs at the high school level and also have the flexibility for the clinical teachers to opt in and out of the mentoring process? The best solution for everyone involved was to begin searching for a second partner high school.

Initially, the university faculty and the Northglenn faculty viewed one another from a pretty stereotypical perspective. It has taken time, patience, and a conscious effort from all participants, UCD faculty as well as Northglenn faculty, to build trust and establish productive working relationships. By learning how to "walk in one another's worlds," significant advancements across partnership functions has occurred and is probably the most positive contributing factor to the continuing forward motion of the partnership accomplishments between Northglenn High School and University of Colorado at Denver. Heading "full speed ahead" into our fourth year as partners in simultaneous renewal, the players have developed mutual trust, common goals, and deep friendships. University participants care about the faculty, staff, students, and goals of Northglenn and, likewise, NGHS participants care about the faculty, staff, teacher candidates, and goals of the university. We have learned and we appreciate what it means to "walk in our partner's world."

SECONDARY PARTNER SCHOOL PORTRAIT:

OREM HIGH SCHOOL

By Project Team: John Childs, John Gardner, Bus Gillespie, Merrell Hansen, Tina Howard, and Nancy Wentworth

---

Scene 1, Orem High School Faculty Room:

"These new student teachers can't do anything. What do they teach them up at BYU? It's a waste of time. I have to start over with each one I get."

"Agreed. And when was the last time you talked to a supervisor? Last semester I told my student teacher to ignore what he said and do what I said. I am about out of energy for any of this after all these years."

"It is pretty old, alright. I told mine no one looks at university evaluations when they hire teachers. They only look at what the cooperating teacher says. I've been doing the same thing with student teachers for ten years with no problem."

"Why don't they just turn them over to us? We'd train them and stop wasting all this time. What do we get out of this, anyway?"

Scene 2, Brigham Young University Education Office:

"How are your new preservice students working out? Any problems this semester?"

"Oh, just the usual. I don't know why some people take student teachers. They seem pretty bored with it. It would help if the cooperating teachers would at least stay in the room. One teacher gave the student teacher the textbook and told her to cover the chapters."

"One student teacher at Orem High is really having a hard time. She's a good kid, but has four different preparations. The classes were hard to discipline from the beginning. How do the teachers survive those killer schedules?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Scene 3, Student Teacher Car Pool:

"I'm exhausted. I had no idea how hard this would be. I still have hours of work to do tonight to be ready for tomorrow."

"Me, too. But I'm also confused. My supervisor and my cooperating teacher aren't on the same page when they give me advice. I just stand and smile at each one, then try to figure it out later."

"What good were all those education classes? Most of it was busy work. I need some heavy work on discipline and motivation right now, not two semesters ago. I didn't even know the questions to ask back then. Now that I have met fourth period, I have plenty! My cooperating teacher doesn't have much use for the university program. He's pretty cynical."

"Mine doesn't do any group work or work with learning styles or any of those things we've studied. I have to assign chapters and give tests on Fridays. The kids hate it. I'm not sure I'll survive this on-the-job training."

Change in high schools does not come easily. Teachers can become insulated from current research and even from careful thought. They often speak as authorities rather than as learners. Other viewpoints, such as those of the professors and student teachers in the university's teacher preparation, are not heard at all. Because conversations such as those above have been all too frequent at Orem High School, the principal, some teachers, and a few university professors have implemented a new kind of professional development centered on preservice certification. Those involved in this project believe it has been successful in beginning a process of renewal. This paper presents the details of the project, the lessons learned, and some specific issues related to the four traditional partner school functions: preservice, inservice, curriculum, and inquiry. Because the partner school role was essential for this project, viewpoints representing the school, the university, and the student teachers are consistently presented; all three played important roles in implementing these changes.

As in every attempt at change, history must be acknowledged. Orem High and the BYU School of Education have been designated partners since 1994. That designation, coupled with participation by both university and public school people in the BYU Leadership Associates' Program, provided dialogue beginning in 1995. Those relationships and discussions have been critical in project development. Although no systemic change took place during the first two years, staff members shared frustrations and hypothesized solutions. During the same time, Orem High

School faced a dilemma of its own: reinvigorating its teachers after approximately 25 percent of its students and staff transferred to a new school. Student numbers dropped from 2,500-plus to about 1,750 students. When the opportunity arose to participate in the Arthur Vining Davis Secondary Partner School Project, those who had been discussing the possibilities of renewal saw a chance to address some of the challenges facing OHS or any professional development school. The informal school-university discussion group decided to move ahead, focusing on professional development through a new preservice program. These were the main ideas:

1. The student teacher and cooperating teacher form a team; grading and planning are genuinely cooperative efforts. The university supervisor takes an active role on each team.

2. Teachers develop professionally during the times the student teacher "solos," using a continuous learning model rather than a "project."

3. Student teaching is an entire semester. Preservice teachers begin the first day of second semester and stay with the program until after school ends. (They spend June with their university instructors. Registration is for winter semester and spring term. Nine hours of education classes are taught concurrently with the twelve hours of student teaching credit.)

4. Teachers work with a multidisciplinary cohort, a new concept in BYU secondary education.

5. Student teachers take education courses during their student teaching. Courses are taught at the high school site, involving practicing teachers as well as professors.

6. Student teachers work with a department rather than with a single teacher. They attend weekly seminars during the school day and may not teach a full schedule.

7. Supervision of student teaching and instruction in education classes crosses subject/discipline lines. Subject specific supervision still occurs and some supervision is in the hands of arts and sciences professors not usually associated with preservice or with the School of Education.

8. Teachers work closely with supervisors who become familiar with the school culture and are seen as partners. Teachers, student teachers, and supervisors meet in a Professional Development Classroom.

9. Education course curricula is shaped by cooperating teachers' involvement and by student teaching experiences.

10. Disciplines in the project are limited to math, science, and social studies. This is partly by design and partly because some of those teachers showed the most interest at the school and at the university.

The first lesson learned was that there is no such thing as enough communication. Meetings were held with the cooperating teachers where the plans were discussed and put into a broader context. What was not sought, however, was the input of enough of them in shaping the program. Although public school administrators and teachers had been part of designing the project, dialogue about the changes had not occurred widely enough. While some teachers knew the project design very well, others initially saw it as a university-imposed program. That reaction, which should have been anticipated, led to a firm commitment to early and frequent dialogue with the teachers who are added to the 1997-98 school year cohort.

The second lesson learned was that there is no such thing as enough communication. (For emphasis, see lesson one above.) This time, the lack of clear purpose showed up the first day of the student teaching experience. One teacher changed his mind and left a student teacher in tears with no place to go. Another teacher turned the class over to the student teacher immediately and informed her she could not leave for seminars because now she was the official teacher. A university supervisor not in agreement with the project talked two preservice candidates out of being part of it, leaving one discipline with no student teachers. Professors teaching the education classes at school were not issued keys and had to find someone to let them in the room everyday.

The consistent presence of the university professors facilitated the transition into the project. Although there were a few rough days, relationships soon were established, roles were clarified, keys were issued, and management details were sorted out. A science professor recruited two student teachers from among his students; a program was developed for the student teacher who had been rebuffed; and the cooperating teacher remembered that this was a new program requiring school-day seminars and a different level of involvement. Everyone began to settle into the new routine.

Scene 4, OHS Faculty Room:

"Where are you headed? I thought you had a student teacher. You don't have to get back to class so fast."

"Yes, I do. My student teacher has seminar tomorrow, so I'll be teaching her lesson. I have to go over this new activity with her so I can do it right."

"So now the university is pulling student teachers out during the time they are supposed to be teaching? When did that happen? And why did you agree to be part of it?"

"Actually, this is a pretty good idea. Two professors, Dr. Merrell Hansen and Dr. Nancy Wentworth, are around to help all the time. We have had some good discussions with my student teacher about what's going on in the class. They have some ideas I haven't tried before that will help my students learn more."

Scene 5, BYU Education Office:

"I actually observed in eight classes in two days. I get a lot more done when I don't have to drive between schools to see student teachers. Some semesters I logged more driving time than observation time. Who are you visiting today?"

"I have two math classes and one French class to visit. The French class is working out well. It's nice to teach in your minor. One math class is giving him a hard time, though. Maybe you could sit in and offer suggestions."

"Yes, I can do that. The history and science people are OK today. Both cooperating teachers said things are going OK so far. I talked to them yesterday and we have a meeting tomorrow so I can get details. I'll see if one of them could observe with us."

"Good idea. Have you readjusted the curriculum plans for the seminar?"

"I had to! That was quite a discussion with the math teachers. I have checked the list of topics we have talked about in the classes against the required areas. We're covering it all, but the order and intensity is very different from my campus classes. I can really show them how theory informs practice–and have them try it the next day. There's nothing like a challenging Intermediate Algebra class to increase the desire to learn."

Scene 6, Student Teacher Car Pool:

"Did Dr. Hansen come in your class today? He was in mine, along with Dr. Wentworth and Mr. Jensen. That's real pressure."

"No, I didn't see him today. I met with three other student teachers who are having problems with kids sluffing. It was good to talk it over. They had some ideas I can try. One of the regular math teachers met with us for about thirty minutes to give us some background on all of the things that have been tried in this school. At least I feel better knowing this isn't a problem just in my class."

"The supervisor visit wasn't bad; it just made me nervous. But I think it will help because we talked about some things I can do to make the cooperative learning groups work better. They all had ideas that might help, so I picked the one I liked best and we planned a lesson for tomorrow. Mr. Gillespie is going to help me teach it."

"Let me know how it works. The last time I did groups, I wasn't too happy with them. But my cooperating teacher was thrilled! She said she didn't have much experience with grouping, so we're kind of learning together. It's comforting to know teachers continue to learn."

Although teaming in public education has been through many iterations, teachers in the project had little experience with it. For them, the relationships with student teachers had been instructors-to-students rather than co-teachers working together to increase student learning. Early dialogue with cooperating teachers indicated some hesitation about working as a team. Part of the concern expressed was that "the real teaching world doesn't work that way." Although that is true, teaming has remained an important focus in the project and is necessary for classroom teachers to renew themselves professionally. The variety of activities makes teaming essential. Because of the school-day seminars, the classroom teachers remained an active part of the classroom team. Even though these student teachers were in place much longer than regular student teachers (eighteen weeks compared to fourteen weeks), the teachers actually left the classrooms far less than during the usual student teaching program. Student teachers also had the opportunity to participate in supervisory activities not related to the classroom, such as planning school-wide Literacy Week activities. Although one of the original ideas was for the cooperating teachers to complete a kind of professional development project, the teaming experience itself provided that experience. The

teaming model created in this project may also help teachers take active steps to reduce teacher isolation, an acknowledged problem present in teacher burnout.

The project has benefited classroom teachers, according to self-reports and interviews. Teachers take student teachers for a variety of reasons; some genuinely want to help an inexperienced teacher while others see it as a break to do other things. Many excellent teachers avoid student teachers completely because they dislike giving up their students. Although the opportunity to team was always there, teachers felt the pressure of tradition or habit to leave the student teachers alone for a significant part of their experience. They were then disconnected from their high school students whom they had to "retrain" after the student teachers left. Moreover, taking classes back for the last five weeks of school was not an enviable task when student contact had not been substantial. Some teachers initially resisted their roles as team members. They were more comfortable withdrawing from the classroom and meeting with the student teachers after school to talk about what had happened. Some hinted at impatience with student teachers and their new ideas; they preferred continuing as they had in the past. By the end of the project, however, all teachers found teaming and closer work with the supervisors to be a valuable learning experience.

Extending student teaching time without pressure to have all classes taught by the student teacher allowed teachers to develop new instructional patterns. One teacher developed a small group learning experience for eight students who had received failing grades the previous two quarters. He met with those students regularly in another classroom, providing them with individual help and attention. At the end of third quarter, six of the eight passed. Other teachers had student teachers become experts in specific subjects, teaching only small sections of the total curricula. Student teachers also had the opportunity to work with different teachers, to see different styles, and to come to conclusions about their teaching preferences.

The initial concerns of the cooperating teachers began to fade as the project progressed. They began to express that the seminars were helping because the students had a chance to think about what was going on. One particular teacher, described by students as very set in his ways, commented that he liked the chance to team because he got good ideas from the student teacher and then was part of putting them in place in the classroom.

The relationship between the cooperating teachers and the university faculty grew steadily stronger. One cooperating teacher said his student teacher had been visited at least once a week, sometimes twice. This was a considerable improvement over previous experiences when student teachers were often seen only two or three times during the entire fourteen weeks. The cooperating teachers were also pleased with the quality of university supervisor involvement. Teachers and supervisors gave the same kinds of information and assistance to student teachers, omitting the common problem of mixed messages. Teachers also began to view professional growth as a process rather than a project due at the end of the year. One experienced teacher said, "This has been a

chance to rethink my teaching. I never thought much about why I graded the way I did until my student teacher asked me about it. I'm not sure that has happened with any other student teacher. I am thinking more about what I do and why I do it that way."

Student teachers also grew professionally during this project. Their seminar questions changed from mechanics and management of the program (How do I stop the kids from talking? What kinds of rules can be established for verbal usage in class?), to instructional questions (How do I pace myself for the 84-minute block class so I don't have a ton of extra, unplanned time?), to individual concerns about ability to continue in the program because of the time commitment. While this progression is usual in student teachers, the shared nature of the cohort experience and the immediacy of the concepts discussed in the university classes were, according to the university supervisors, more exciting and deeper than these same things discussed in campus-based classes. By the end of the student teaching part of the project, student teachers were saying that they could not imagine doing it any other way. The word spread on campus as numbers of preservice candidates began to contact professors to see if they could be a part of the next cohort.

University faculty felt much more connected to their students and to the schools in this program. The topics that are a part of classroom theory and methods course are the same but the school setting changes many things. One faculty member commented, "It's not that we're in the school that's important. It's that the kids are. They see why thinking about evaluation and learning styles when planning instruction is essential to good teaching. They're not separate topics as they are on campus. They make better connections this way." The content area professor participant added, "This is changing the <u>way</u> we teach, not just <u>where</u> we teach."

The university supervisors are also becoming part of the school culture. Their frequent presence is important to working in a school. They are now known by name rather than by job description and seen as important resources for quality teaching. The designation of a Partnership Classroom provides a physical center for professional development for everyone. This can be enhanced over time as the relationship between the university supervisors and the teachers continues to grow. Trust is essential if renewal is to continue and flourish.

The project, of course, also faces challenges. Some have been alluded to earlier in this paper. Others emerged as the first year came to a close. These challenges include the already mentioned communication difficulties and the ever-present challenge of time. Teachers, supervisors, and student teachers would benefit from reflective dialogue around many of the issues that arise during student teaching. Dialogue before, during, and after student teaching would enrich and enhance the experience. Because management becomes such an overwhelming issue for beginning teachers (indeed, for all participants), reflection and dialogue should be a more prominent part of the program. The challenge will be to provide and value consistent dialogue with many voices. The goal is thoughtful practitioners, not good technicians.

Another need is for a liaison at the school, an individual (probably a teacher) who can be a kind of "operations manager" for this university/school partnership venture. If management of details can be streamlined, it will allow for more time to be involved in issues of substance. Scheduling, inviting, coordinating, and data collecting are all important aspects of the project; it would be helpful to have a chief worrier for those details. This probably implies a further financial commitment for professional development schools by either the university or the school district.

There are also challenges at the university. Many professors chose not to be involved because of the changes. The traditional demarcation lines limiting the roles of the university professor, the cooperating teacher, and student teacher are acceptable, even desirable, to many.

Questions now arise about expanding the program. Resources of the school and the university are finite; programs such as this one have implications for partner schools and for the universities with which they partner. Although the project was successful and will be repeated during the 1997-98 school year, it impacted only 20 percent of the Orem High teachers and only three secondary education certification areas with the eight students in the cohort. A quality standard may need to be identified and clarified before other subjects and schools are added.

The four professional development school functions are apparent throughout this project. Preservice is the vehicle through which the other elements happen. Teacher renewal (inservice) is a natural outgrowth of teaming and leads to professional development as a natural part of teaching. Inservice has traditionally been difficult, even ineffective, in secondary schools. This project has implications for a new way of thinking about professional development; it becomes an ongoing learning model instead of an inservice course taken after school or on Saturday. Future programs will continue to explore this idea. Curriculum changes naturally in this kind of project because relevancy is critical. The challenge is to maintain the high degree of interest while providing intellectual rigor and encouraging reflective thinking. Inquiry led to this project as possibilities were discussed, revised, and proposed. The basic reason for change is deeply rooted in inquiry as new ways are developed to provide the best program for those in the university and those in the schools. Interviews and analysis of collected data will be an ongoing part of moving this project forward. Inquiry must now extend to individual teachers as part of professional growth. These four functions are not separate; they are as intertwined and essential to the learning spiral as are the three parties involved in the project.

Scene 7, OHS Faculty Room:

> *"Having these student teachers in the classroom until the end of the year is a good idea. They have felt a major responsibility for the learning that takes place–and the added difficulties the end of the year brings."*

"And having two people available in the classroom this time of year isn't bad either! The student teachers have really stayed in there. Merrell and Nancy said the seminar comments have become quite reflective. They are looking back from a learning perspective rather than just from survival. I think a lot of it rubbed off on me."

"I have learned several new things from my student teacher. It will be great to try them first semester and even better to know there will be a new student teacher coming second semester. I am looking forward to working with one instead dreading it."

"It's a good change. It's been good for the kids and for me. I would like to spend more time in three-way dialogue next year. We all have things to offer to make this better for our students."

Scene 8, BYU Education Office:

"Have you noticed any big differences in your students since the public schools finished their year? My campus classes are moving along, but the cohort members are inquiring into things they know are important. It's a different level of interest."

"They've been actually quite emotional. They were as connected to their students as many first-year teachers. One of the big surprises for me was the cooperating teachers; wasn't it great to be part of that enthusiasm! I've worked with some of them before and never seen anything like this."

Scene 9, On Campus, After the Final Class:

"I didn't know if I'd make it through this. I have never worked so hard in my life. How do people do it without the support system we've had? I'm glad I didn't have one of those cooperating teachers my roommate had. She didn't get much help at all."

"I know what you mean. I've loved every minute. Well, almost every minute. I have a lot to do this summer before I start teaching. I know I will be fine and that I have people who will help. My cooperating teacher and I are sharing some things this summer that we didn't have time to finish."

"They were great, weren't they? Just think. In a few years, maybe we can help new teachers the same way they've helped us."

Parkway South High School/Maryville University

A Year of Ripples and Waves: Expanding and Extending the Partnership

By Kathe Rasch and the Parkway South Arthur Vining Davis Council–
Ron Banfield, Kathe Rasch, Nancy Williams, Mary Ellen Finch,
Craig Larson, Wayne Mosher, Linda Pitelka

The Parkway South High School/Maryville University Partnership has evolved over several years, with its initial purposes coming from seemingly mutual benefits of pairing a Coalition of Essential Schools high school and a field-based teacher education program modeled on reflective practice. All members of the partnership have seen significant results this year as a variety of factors came together–some as a result of intense planning, others as we worked to "formalize" the partnership and explore how to have the partnership inform the work of all partners.

The Arthur Vining Davis (AVD) planning team had as its goal extension of our dialogue together and the involvement of more participants. The partnership's proposal for the AVD grant from the Institute for Educational Inquiry highlighted four ways to accomplish this: through mentoring triads, through a seminar group that would engage faculty in reading and talking about teaching (sharing the energy), by extending the number of teachers who have some contact (not necessarily as supervising teachers) with student teachers/interns from Maryville, and by improving communication with all of those involved in light of the postulates to which the consortium has committed itself. This portrait will provide a snapshot of the progress that we (the partnership) have made due to the commitment of the partners and complemented by the outside memberships, financial resources, and critical friends who have been of assistance.

The portrait is organized to chronicle our progress as it relates specifically to simultaneous renewal, focusing on three of the four moral dimensions of teaching as identified by Goodlad (1990, 1994), specifically: pedagogical nurturing, access to knowledge, and stewardship of the school. We, the members of both institutions as well as our students, believe that our work and progress this year specifically addresses three of the moral dimensions of teaching to which we have committed as part of the sixteenth setting of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER); this portrait specifically addresses those dimensions. At the same time, the partnership's work reflects all four goals outlined in Clark's document, *NNER Compact on Partner Schools* (1995), in that we (Maryville and Parkway collectively) have aspired to develop a partner school that has as its purposes education of children and youth, preparing educators, providing professional development, and engaging in inquiry. We have not, however, chosen to organize our portrait specifically around those purposes; the moral dimensions mentioned earlier have provided a "best fit" to describe our work.

One will find stories of Maryville faculty and students as well as Parkway faculty and students interwoven in the portrait in the same way that we (all members of the partnership) have found our work increasingly interwoven in the day-to-day practice of partner members. It is increasingly difficult to speak of "we" and "they". The "our" and "we" addressed in this partnership has become truly inclusive of both partners; the work described herein has involved all partners regularly and systematically. We believe that this is an important manifestation of years of partnership work. There is a new level of maturity for the partnership that is chronicled herein. This portrait will chronicle significant accomplishments for the partnership, including a year of new leadership at Parkway South and clear direction for the future of the partnership.

Parkway South High School

Parkway South High School is one of five ninth- through twelfth-grade secondary schools in the Parkway School District, a suburban district located in West St. Louis County. The district is one of the largest in the state (serving 22,000 students) and was consolidated in the 1950s when increasing numbers of families moved west from St. Louis City and the inner ring of older St. Louis County suburbs. The district may be described as "essentially" middle and upper middle class. A very small percentage of the student body who live in the district might be categorized as minority, although the English as a Second Language Program within the district is rapidly growing through enrollment of children from patrons involved in international business. The majority of minority students who attend school within the district (African-American) attend through the St. Louis Voluntary Interdistrict Desegregation Plan that provides transportation for the St. Louis City minority students who choose to attend St. Louis County Schools.

Parkway South High School currently enrolls almost 2,000 students, grades nine through twelve. Approximately 18 percent of these students are African-American. Few students receive free or reduced lunch and the mobility rate of Parkway students is relatively low. The dropout rate at Parkway South is increasing from about 5 percent; staff members are studying for whom this figure actually accounts. Approximately 95 percent of the student body attends some form of higher education institution upon graduation from South High and parents are generally satisfied with the education that their children receive there. Indeed, one of the issues raised by parents at the time South High entered the Coalition of Essential Schools and began to consider some restructuring was, "Why fix something that isn't broke?" The school employs 128 professional staff, most with master's and doctoral degrees and more than twenty years of teaching experience, though recent retirements have provided opportunities for young, new staff members.

Parkway South joined the Coalition of Essential Schools in 1986 and has struggled with the extent to which the school's faculty as a whole embrace the CES principles and work. As of about

two years ago, the faculty were split one-third, one-third, and one-third with support, opposition, and ambivalence about the Coalition focus. Two years ago, the principal of South moved to the area superintendent position. After one year with Mr. Gary Mazzola as a supportive interim principal, Dr. Wayne Mosher became principal of the school in July 1996. At this point (August 1997), the partnership is thriving, having witnessed two changes in high school leadership and a change in superintendent. Testimony to the systematization of this partnership is that we have not skipped a beat, progress has continued and grown stronger throughout changes in leadership.

Dr. Mosher has instituted several sets of planning activities and meetings designed to rekindle conversations in the school around issues of teaching and learning. He has long been known as an administrator who strongly supports the development of teachers and has also worked as an adjunct faculty member for Maryville for a long time. He was aware of the Maryville/Parkway South Partnership when he applied for the principalship and knew that there was extensive teacher education going on in the building. During this past year, he has been present at partnership council meetings, contributed significantly to moving the thinking forward for all partners, and welcomed the Maryville partners into the inner operations of the school, while also thinking about how the school will interact with Maryville's programs and priorities.

The Maryville/Parkway South Partnership began when Maryville took an interest in Parkway South's work with Coalition of Essential Schools principles and began to place student teachers and practicum students at that site in 1992. In 1993, a grant allowed Maryville's School of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, and Parkway South to begin ground-up planning of an entirely new secondary program. During that fall, the partnership was part of Maryville's application to the NNER with Harris-Stowe and the St. Louis Public Schools. The partnership has operated with a history of participatory decision making and a commitment to joint responsibility for the preparation of teachers and the development and simultaneous renewal of Maryville and Parkway South. The 1996-97 year was one of great anticipation–the secondary program design that was so carefully crafted was to get its first trial. At the same time, the spirit of the design and its quite unique features would be apparent to the Parkway teachers working with Maryville students. Parkway South (and Maryville faculty) anxiously anticipated the arrival of a new leader, eager to see what vision and plans he had for the school. It is in this context that many "firsts" occurred. The partnership has extended its influence in ever-widening concentric circles. Sometimes the leap from one ripple to another was easy, at other times it was more treacherous. But we have much growth to document, and look toward next year with a proposal for a long-range set of goals for the partnership that have taken shape through "conversation" and action on the part of many courageous enough to jump into uncharted waters, believing that the work will create ever wider concentric circles of influence.

Throughout this journey, our work has been guided by the attention to the aforementioned moral dimensions of teaching. Conversations among the members of the partnership have had

increased focus and urgency. The following sections deal specifically with the results of this year's partnership efforts.

Exploring and Expanding our Professional Lives

Goodlad and others (1995) have highlighted the importance of developing one's teaching by considering the moral aspects of the work that we do. He highlights four moral dimensions of a teacher's work as s/he engages students, specifically:

a. Pedagogical nurturing (teachers continuing commitment and attention to pedagogy; the ensurance that teachers' pedagogy is constantly under reflection and refinement);
b. Access to knowledge (the assurance that all students will have access to the information and skills that they need to succeed in a democratic society);
c. Enculturation into a social and political democracy (the day-to-day practice that reinforces the role of the teacher in helping students understand the processes, functions, and roles of each student's development in a democratic society); and
d. Stewardship of the school (commitment of all in the school, including preservice teachers, so that all adults in the school are concerned with the care of the school community and its functioning within the larger community(ies) that it serves.

The expansion of our dialogue involved moving from about eight university faculty and ten to twelve Parkway South faculty to include five more Maryville faculty and, in one way or another, about twenty more Parkway South teachers and administrators. But numbers only begin to convey the story. The specifics of this year's engagement follow, with reference to the initiatives undertaken by the partnership and the school with its new leadership as being essential elements that have complemented each other. "Students" refer to Parkway South High School students and preservice teacher education students pursuing a new post-baccalaureate program based at Parkway South High School.

Pedagogical Nurturing

Over and over again throughout the year, the participants' (school and university faculty, as well as preservice teachers) conversations returned to teaching. The partnership began because of a common interest to rethink and reexamine teaching practice in a large, comprehensive public high school as well as in the university.

The 1996-97 year was the first time that we implemented the new secondary program that had been collectively designed by PSH faculty, School of Education faculty, and Arts and Sciences faculty. The "we" referred to here is truly the collective "we" that has come about because of the partnership. This post-baccalaureate program was designed for fifteen months and followed the school calendar, not the university calendar, for two summer sessions and the entire school year. For all but October through December, our first cohort of nine preservice teachers spent their time at Parkway South. During the school year they were paired with a teacher from South, many of whom were new to involvement with Maryville.

Rather than separating the content methods study for these students, a mentoring triad of one arts and sciences faculty member, one School of Education faculty member, and a Parkway teacher met throughout the year with the students from their respective content areas. We have come to realize that this triad, unique in its structure and composition, is a powerful and innovative force for both the preservice teachers and the triad participants. After first conducting admissions interviews and making the decisions as to whom they would accept into the program, the triad teams met throughout the year with the preservice students to assist them in understanding their role within the school, learning to teach their respective discipline, and assessing the learning of the secondary students. They also met collectively on a bimonthly basis to share what the triads were all learning and what issues all of the triads needed to address.

These teams, moving slowly and haltingly at first, met with preservice teacher education students to discuss what they were teaching, how they were teaching, and how to interpret their experiences at Parkway South. Students and faculty worked through issues such as selection of novels, how much time to spend teaching about waves in a physics class, whether history should be the overarching focus of all social studies classes, and how to evaluate the unit that the preservice students were teaching. Mentoring triads supported Maryville students, supervised teaching, and advised them on their action research projects. They also became confidants and counselors for the students as they were needed. In some cases, the students began to perceive the role of the teams only as confidants and purveyors of emotional support. This was not the original intent; the exploration of the roles and responsibility of these teams remains an area of emphasis for the next year. In addition, Dr. Mosher has indicated his interest in becoming more involved in working with the secondary students personally.

Also of importance was the deluge of communication among mentoring triad members, whether or not the preservice students were present to provoke the conversation. Much of this correspondence occurred through e-mail, copied to all of the triads so that the conversation was broadly shared. Mentoring triad members report increased understanding about each others' roles and perspectives, and the conversations about their own teaching have been rich, lengthy and, at times, contentious. The teams begin their second year with increased understanding of their own

pedagogy and about how to specifically help Maryville students think about their pedagogy as well. The importance of the liberal arts preparation of the Maryville students became quite clear after mentoring teams watched Maryville students struggle with even the beginning rudiments of planning. The liberal arts preparation of teacher education students is particularly important as it relates to post-baccalaureate students who, while having a major in content areas, do not have the skills to move from academic majors to teaching emphases. The Parkway teachers in the mentoring teams understand this as well as the Maryville faculty.

With the phasing out of the old, more traditional undergraduate teacher education program and the phasing in of the new program, twenty-one Maryville teacher education students (a record number) had experiences at Parkway South in the past year. In a rather unanticipated way, the sheer number of students to be placed pushed the agenda of simultaneous renewal forward. This record number of placements necessitated convincing, cajoling, or cheerfully recruiting new teachers who had never had experience working with Maryville students. Since the program is based upon a model that advocates reflective practice, those previously involved in the program spent a great deal of time helping new participants understand that involvement with the teacher education students would mean renewed reflection on their own practice as well. Some unfortunately placed snow days in January meant that this preparation was not as systematic as it should have been, and there will be a need for rebuilding a "big picture" understanding this fall. But the Partnership Council expanded those interested in the preparation of new teachers. These placements also expanded attention to the partnership and the possibilities beyond the placement of student teachers. These Parkway South teachers have also had many ideas and suggestions to help modify our fledgling program design.

The conversation of all of these groups (mentoring triads, cooperating teachers, program planners, administrators) came together at a two-day retreat in April. One of the foci of the retreat was to review, together, how we were all helping beginners with pedagogy. What we learned in the process was that each participant was thinking more deeply about his/her own practice as a result of their reflection with the preservice teachers.

While the teacher education program was going on, the new principal was also exploring the ways in which he and the teachers would begin to have conversations about teaching and learning. The co-coordinator of the Maryville program (a Maryville faculty member) began to participate in several school-wide initiatives, enabling the Maryville faculty to have representation at substantive discussions in the school. In the case of Parkway South, Maryville was invited to attend and participate in weekly administrative council meetings, department chair meetings discussing substantive issues of teaching and learning for Parkway South students, and meetings about North Central and the Strategic Planning Task Force which also involved PSH students, parents, feeder school teachers, and community members. This participation has resulted in an increased understanding of school issues for the Maryville faculty, but it has also sent a strong message that

Maryville is committed to the work of Parkway South. South High faculty is now quite comfortable in approaching the Maryville coordinator to discuss any issues that are of interest to them.

Parkway South faculty also formally became Maryville faculty members. Two faculty members and the principal have taught both graduate courses and courses for preservice teacher education students. One PSH teacher was formally invited to all SOE meetings and the collective mentoring team meetings.

At the same time, the arts and sciences faculty has become a full partner in this process as well. Their work in mentoring triads and with Parkway South faculty as graduate students in their classes has brought a new level of conversation about the role in arts and sciences in every aspect of teacher education. There has been substantive conversation on the role of each of their own pedagogy and that of their content area in the development of preservice secondary teachers.

Finally, Maryville and Parkway South formally established a council for the partnership that spent this year (1996-97) finding its way into our work and each institution's structures. Meeting once a month for two hours, this group (including the principal, the dean, program coordinators, and faculty from both institutions) struggled with how to best proceed to extend the partnership to become more involved in the renewal of Parkway South, Maryville University's teacher education programs, and the renewal work that we are attempting to deepen together. We tried to formulate some goals in the fall, advancing some ideas about how to position the partnership but, in the end, decided to move slowly and, to a certain extent, see what emerged throughout the year. We did, however, share long discussions about how all of us could help make the teaching and learning at Parkway South meaningful for all students and the respective faculties of both institutions. This council became a sounding board for many ideas, helping those of us who then move out in the broader "ripples" to try out ideas and coordinate our efforts to move forward. It became clear that there was an ever-expanding realization of commitment to simultaneous renewal and the benefits for all involved. This is the group that planned the retreat that has resulted in direction for our work in the 1997-98 school year.

Access to Knowledge

Conversations about the teaching and learning of Parkway South students have occurred on a daily basis with Maryville students and cooperating teachers. As each and every one of us worked with Parkway South students, we spent much time talking about disengaged students and students who were not eager to pursue their schoolwork. Indeed, these conversations about learning and about initiative are the ones that cause all of us to pause. We still have much to do to help PSH students who are unengaged to connect schooling and learning to a meaningful life. Answers to these hard questions will come from a long-term commitment to addressing them together. For

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

example, Maryville teacher education students raised significant questions about the tracking in classes at South and its relationship to the kind of learning experiences for PSH students. They have questioned and collected data about students' perceptions of honors classes, teaching in honors and non-honors classes, and student mobility in and out of the different tracks of classes. In the current Parkway South North Central plan, issues of student engagement will dovetail directly with the questions that the preservice teachers are raising.

Another aspect of "access to knowledge" that we explored together had to do with the knowledge that we assumed came with those teacher education students with baccalaureate degrees in a content area. The mentoring triads worked with Maryville students and experienced first hand the struggles to make sense of disciplinary knowledge as one tries to bring it into perspective for high school students. In reality, the faculties of PSH and Maryville (both education and arts and sciences) have done a great deal of collective rethinking about the development of the preservice teachers in such an intense program. In particular, the faculties have grappled with where one begins to help a preservice teacher think about the knowledge that they have, how it is structured and organized, and how one determines what knowledge will be of worth in helping Parkway South students during their high school careers. More simply, there has been the realization that questions about what one chooses to teach are incredibly complex and value laden. These conversations will continue at a more sophisticated level in the next year as we have restructured the work of the triads. We learned a lot from the social studies mentoring triad that was able to couple their work with a traditional methods class taught by a PSH faculty member. This structure allowed this team to ask more questions earlier and at a more sophisticated level. This team has helped the rest of us think about our own beliefs and values pertaining to knowledge about teaching and content. We polarize (or dichotomize) them much less than we did in the past.

Each preservice teacher education student from Maryville completed an action research project while at Parkway South. These projects were part of their master's degree requirements and required systematic data collection. The purpose of the project was to have preservice teacher education students engage in systematic inquiry into a topic that was of intense interest to them, emerging from their work with Parkway South students. Cooperating teachers and mentoring triads actively assisted the preservice teachers in identifying topics for inquiry and focusing their data collection work. While this action research requirement has been part of Maryville's teacher education program for a number of years, the number of students and, subsequently, the number of projects did influence departments at Parkway South more this year than it has in the past. Many of the projects were around issues of "access to knowledge," such as the perceived benefits of honors courses, the results of modifying mastery learning, students' perceptions of their ninth-grade experience, and the development of character education through the teaching of literature. This year, for the first time, the mentoring triads and other students heard the oral presentations of these

projects. We will formalize the sharing of this data with the entire PSH community while also trying to get some Maryville and Parkway South faculty to participate in action research together during the 1997-98 school year.

Finally, the PSH school-wide discussions about critical thinking were emphasized during the April retreat. Using a specific framework for critical thinking, we have begun to incorporate this framework into our plans for future work with South High students and Maryville teacher education students and faculty. The Partnership Council anticipates the adoption of our strategic goals, the development of an action plan, and its alignment with the school-wide strategic planning process in the fall. Dr. Mosher intends to use critical thinking as the organizing idea for all Parkway South school discussions in the 1997-98 school year.

Stewardship of the School

In some ways, the previous benchmarks have all carried with them attention to an ongoing concern about how to make all of us part of the community that stewards the students at Parkway South. Tying the Maryville/Parkway South Partnership planning directly to the long-range plan of the school has required time, patience, and a willingness to wait on planning as other activities unfolded. This nonlinear approach to planning and consensus building is more comfortable for some of us (faculty and students) than for others. Many times this year, people have asked "Where are we going?" and "What does he or she want?" We have all learned that through communication, attention to relationships and even more communication, the collective faculties have forged progress in talking about teaching and learning while not always having the specifics of our plan laid out. Through our year of conversation, reading, exploration, and experimentation, many faculty from both institutions have begun to find their "niche" in the conversations about the partnership if not in the specifics of all that they will ultimately contribute. As yet, the voice of Parkway South students in this whole process of planning has been absent. We must explore how to incorporate high school student voices more carefully in the 1997-98 year. We will also need to expand the role of the preservice teacher education students in the Partnership Council.

With careful attention among the partners, it is safe to say that all involved have a better understanding of at least some aspects of what we are trying to do. As the university faculty spend the next year moving more into the life of Parkway South, examining the school's schedule, program, proficiencies, and goals, there will be new tensions. As the teacher education program expands, the number of Parkway South teachers needed to be involved will also grow. Other schools in the district have expressed some interest to be involved. Exploratory commitment from another Parkway School District high school will have to begin anew because the principal of that school resigned in June and it is unclear how much of that school's commitment was tied to the departing administrator.

In the process, all faculty members from both institutions have been extremely forthright about their commitment and their misgivings. Many misgivings are related to time and logistics; others come from the uneasiness of having to figure out how this simultaneous renewal will occur without a clear outline about how to proceed in the creation of the broader partnership. The leadership at Maryville and Parkway South provided incredible support, time, and resources for the work of the partnership. Their courage to "jump in and try" has made the partnership possible.

We begin the partnership's next year with specific plans for the preservice Maryville students, PSH students, and ourselves as faculties (including the arts and sciences faculty). The partnership's planning is now connected to the strategic planning process at both institutions and cuts across more departments at the high school than ever before. We continue to communicate, communicate, communicate.

Our membership in the National Network for Educational Renewal has helped us keep focus on what is important in the partnership through attention to simultaneous renewal and the moral dimensions of our work together. We are now moving to attend collectively to the stewardship of Parkway South. The entering freshman class of the high school has many students with challenges. The personalization of the high school experience for students remains an important emphasis for Parkway South in the next years; there are now partners from Maryville committed to help with the experience. The strategic planning for the school, the university's teacher education programs, and the partnership are on course. We do believe that many adventures await us collectively, with strength in the depth of conversation and commitment for Parkway South High School. But we have enriched partnership experiences and a framework for future work that ensures the partnership will be focused on the work of ongoing renewal for all faculties and students involved.

Provo High School Portrait

In Partnership with Brigham Young University

By Patti Harrington, Provo High School

Background and Theory

School-university partnerships operate under the assumption that teaching and learning can best be advanced through cooperation of school and university personnel. Mutual cooperation, it is believed, is best spent in four key domains of schooling: preservice (preparing teaching candidates), inservice (improving the skills of teachers), curriculum development (improving the materials used to teach), and inquiry (research to understand and improve teaching and learning).

In 1996, Provo High School (PHS) entered into a formal partnership relationship with Brigham Young University (BYU) with desires to attend to each of the four domains of partnership work. We identified two key projects to focus our work: 1) establish ninth-grade interdisciplinary teaming, with teachers meeting to coordinate curriculum that "makes sense" for ninth-grade students; and 2) revise the student teacher/cooperating teacher agreement and seek additional ideas to enhance the process. The first project involved inservice and curriculum development and, with a thorough evaluation in place, added to the body of inquiry regarding teaming, curriculum mapping, and methods of increasing academic success for ninth-grade students. The second project primarily involved preservice but also offered spin-off value to inservice, both at BYU and at PHS. This portrait will capture the ideas and information that have been generated in the first year of this partnership.

Provo High School is an urban ninth- through twelfth-grade high school serving 1,850 students. We have dozens of AP and honors classes and we serve 12 percent in special education classes. Our minority population is 14 percent of the student body, primarily Latino. We serve students whose families own multiple computers as well as those who are living out of motel rooms and cars. Provo High School is located in Provo, Utah, across the street from Brigham Young University. BYU is owned and operated by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and serves 30,000 students, most of whom are members of the Church. BYU is re-establishing its early roots–those grounded upon the preparation of teachers. Their College of Education was just renamed a School of Education, and the entire university is being reorganized in order to create a Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling (CITES). CITES will be a primary focus for the university in the years to come.

The PHS-BYU partnership, heretofore, has been one that primarily revolved around relationships between PHS teachers and BYU instructors. That is, due to close friendships and

relationships and the proximity of our campuses, informal partnership projects have existed between PHS and BYU for many years (for example, science field trips and studies, dance camps, equipment donations, etc.). Further, student teachers from BYU have been trained on the campus of Provo High School for more than twenty-five years. With our extensive history and good relationship with the informal partnership with BYU, we at Provo High felt comfortable dealing with sensitive issues, have worked toward two-way resources and responsibilities, and felt that we had as much to contribute to BYU as the university may contribute to PHS. While the partnership efforts were not new to PHS, the formalizing of them was. Sensing the opportunity for growth for each partner, we immediately went to work.

Our team consisted of one from Brigham Young University and four from Provo High School. Team members included: Dr. Chris Crowe, professor of English, BYU; Janet Cooper, science teacher, PHS; Darren Hirsche, geography teacher, PHS; Betty Clark, PE teacher, PHS; and Dr. Patti Harrington, principal, PHS, and also Chair of the BYU-PHS Partnership Committee. Provo High School organized the work, the committee, and wrote the grant for funding. Chris Crowe was asked to be involved because he and Patti were associates together in a former partnership inquiry group. All others were involved due to their responsibility and/or background for the identified projects. Darren directed the ninth-grade study, Betty had extensive background in working with student teachers, and Janet had brainstormed and utilized some innovative ideas in enhancing both preservice and inservice in the partnership.

Project One: Preservice and Inservice Through Improved Student Teaching/Cooperating Teacher Arrangements

In the summer of 1996, immediately upon receiving an Arthur Vining Davis Foundations Secondary Partner School grant from the Institute for Educational Inquiry, Provo High School convened its partnership committee to initiate its work. Chris Crowe was unable to meet throughout that year, but the committee forged ahead. Provo High convened its department chair committee to review the Cooperating Teacher Agreement with BYU. Several dissatisfactions were noted, including having too many student teachers on campus at any one time who were lacking adequate supervision by some PHS teachers and BYU instructors. We spent three different meetings revising the Agreement. The document was then reviewed by the faculty-at-large for further modifications. Finally, it went to the school's site-based Decision-Making Committee (DMC) for final approval, which it received.

This document, dated November 1996, is now final from the perspective of Provo High School, though still labeled "draft." It remains as a draft with an invitation to BYU to dialogue about or negotiate its contents, although this has not yet been done. One of the puzzles this document has

created is, to whom is it sent? Currently, there is no one person identified on the BYU campus who can speak for the entire student teaching placement issue, regardless of subject area. As things stand now, it would take full BYU campus involvement on the part of Provo High to inform all stakeholders regarding the revised Agreement. Thus, while PHS has incorporated this document into its operations, there is no such incorporation at BYU except as it must oblige, given the nature of changes that have been initiated at PHS. Further, as individual members of the BYU community have seen the document, they, too, are not in the position of influence or power to approve or negotiate the document. That is, neither Chris Crowe nor even the dean of the School of Education himself has the power to control the BYU variables regarding student teaching placements. We are hopeful that the reorganization of teaching and learning on the BYU campus will resolve this dilemma.

The second piece of the preservice goal was to enhance current practices in preservice and inservice and provide innovative ways to train one another. This work is still in development with ideas coming from Janet Cooper, who has worked extensively and informally in partnership with her science colleagues on the BYU campus. She has developed a list of potential ways we could share ideas, students, and experiences to enhance partnership work. This is a beginning, one which views partnership experiences as those which involve students and teachers at all levels: doctoral, master's, and bachelor's degree candidates as well as ninth- through twelfth-graders and their instructors on both campuses. The ideas in this document, if implemented in conjunction with many others that could be generated by thinking creatively about the entire university experience as it relates to public schooling, could well lead to a total restructuring of preservice and inservice activities.

Project Two: Curriculum Development and Inquiry Through Ninth-Grade Interdisciplinary Studies

Provo High School's historical statistics indicate that ninth graders are the most likely students to drop out of high school. In order to address this concern, in 1995-96 Provo High piloted a ninth-grade teaming project that required specific class placements of students and teachers in a four-subject plan. The pilot had many benefits, primarily involving consistent and meaningful planning by teachers together. It also had some major drawbacks in "forced" scheduling of teachers and students. Further, it only included one-half of the ninth-grade class.

After a careful evaluation, PHS decided to retain the strengths of the pilot and eliminate the drawbacks. As a result, in 1996-97, as part of our partnership plan for curriculum development and continued inquiry, we formulated another teaming concept, one that did not require tight scheduling but rather allowed and encouraged close teacher planning to benefit all ninth graders. Thus, in this past year, all ninth-grade students have had the benefit of mutual planning by their Geography, English, and SEOP (Student Education Occupation Plan Business) teachers. It is now common for

students to receive content assignments for major papers from their Geography teacher, receive help on the structure of that paper in English, and work on the format of the paper in their SEOP class, where computer use is required. In this way, education becomes more meaningful, cohesive, and less confusing for the ninth-grade student, while s/he is still held for appropriate outcomes in learning. We believe it should lead to greater success for ninth graders (fewer dropouts, better grades) and we are in the process of evaluating the project to gauge its effectiveness.

As a part of this second thrust for ninth graders, we also have increased our technology options for all students. We established a full-time "drop-in" computer lab in our English area for students to access technology help all day, everyday. We have a schedule that permits drop-in use and we require that all major papers are computer-driven. We have Internet services for home use by students who may be ill, homebound, suspended, or just desire home study. We also have acquired tutoring software to enable students to continue their studies at home in language arts, math, and science.

Emerging Dilemmas

This experience has been successful in some respects, as noted in the narrative, but has also brought to light several dilemmas:

- Those people representing a school or university in a partnership must have the authority and/or power to accomplish the various goals of the partnership, or the goals of a partnership must be limited to reflect that authority/power held by the individual members of the partnership. Our PHS-BYU Partnership is struggling in that the goals require more authority or power than is offered by BYU partner members, and partner members from BYU do not have the authority or power to influence or change the university to meet the needs of the PHS-BYU Partnership.

- A university is a large, loosely coupled system. In order to make changes that involve many content areas of the university, a public school faces a daunting task. Who is the contact for making substantial changes in the way student teaching is done? Who is the audience? How would we begin to implement major changes in the way teacher training is done for undergraduate students, not to mention doctoral and master's students who are seeking graduate degrees in education-related fields? Who might control the selection of doctoral studies such that those studies became action research pieces, with research being done in our partner school classrooms, adding to the body of "real life" public school issues? If we are to see real reform in these areas, assuming it is desired by BYU as it is by PHS, then we

need to alter the locus of control such that reform is stimulated and aspects of reform controlled.

- Provo High School has changed the way it does "business" with regard to student teaching, including implementing controversial changes with the potential to harm teachers (i.e., not allowing student teachers to team with mediocre teachers, limiting the number of student teachers allowed to any one PHS teacher, etc.). We are monitoring our changes to ensure their positive effect. Brigham Young University has not made any changes. Tradition, though questionable in its effectiveness, marches on. We somehow need to jerk the status quo into consciousness for improved practice to occur. This may be true on both campuses.

- University professors are under- or unrewarded for partnership work. (Chris Crowe was unable to join our partnership meetings all year.) Understandably, professors may have less interest in such work than they do for their other responsibilities given the placement of rewards in promotion and salary. University instructors must receive reinforcement for partnership work in the form of salary or promotions. Likewise, public school teachers are under-rewarded for their work with student teachers. No business professor would expect an eight- to sixteen-week business internship for a student for the mere cost of $75.00 (approximately the payment given to cooperating teachers). The entire reward system for public school/ university partnerships needs careful review.

- Finally, a third-party evaluation of what we do and how it impacts our learners on both campuses is clearly needed.

Next Steps

1. The leadership change at Provo High School will require commitment by the new principal who must develop the collegiality that typifies this relationship.

2. The School of Education at BYU needs to become a reality, with people and resources clearly identified to focus on public schools and how relationships with public schools can increase the effectiveness of real-life instruction on the campus of BYU for teaching candidates. Within this school, authority and power for teaching placements/graduate studies needs to be monitored for consistency and congruity. There must be a group established to deal with public school reform and issues of preservice, inservice, curriculum

development, and inquiry. This group must include some public educators–teachers, not just administrators–who will address these issues and make action research a reality.

3. A process of evaluation for both BYU and PHS (or public schools, in general) needs to be identified for continued partnership work. It may be useful to identify and hire a third-party evaluator who can look at specific BYU-Public School Partnership issues with an objective eye, citing strengths, weaknesses, and areas of confusion.

4. The reward systems for university faculty and public educators need careful scrutiny and revision so that educators in both public and university settings are encouraged to dialogue and work toward positive academic reform and greater student success.

A Portrait of the Partnership Between Richland Northeast High School and Columbia College

By Lucy Snead, Columbia College

This portrait gives a brief history of the partnership between Richland Northeast High School (RNE) and Columbia College (CC) and addresses these questions: Why did our schools want to engage for a year in inquiry about renewing public education and teacher education simultaneously? What did we learn and accomplish? How did we accomplish our task? What are our next steps?

A Brief History of the Partnership

Richland Northeast High School is a suburban school with 125 faculty and 1,800 students, situated northeast of Columbia, the capital of South Carolina. Although in the suburbs, RNE has acquired some of the characteristics of an urban school because of increased city growth, the completion of the beltway, and changes in housing patterns. The school is located near a major army base, a factor that produces both a transient and diverse student population. The faculty, of whom over 75 percent have master's degrees or beyond, offers a comprehensive program including fifteen AP courses, two magnet programs, a broad fine arts program, Naval Junior ROTC, four national award-winning journalism programs, and twenty-six athletic teams for students in ten sports. Faculty and students cooperate in over fifty extracurricular student organizations including six that are solely devoted to providing community service. The theme of the school is "A place where every student is important."

Founded in 1854, Columbia College is a Methodist-supported, private, four-year college for women with a historic commitment to the education of teachers. About 30 percent of the 1,200 students are minorities, and over 40 percent of all graduates receive teacher certification. Recently the College was ranked for the third consecutive year by *U.S. News and World Report* as one of the Top Ten Regional Liberal Arts Colleges in the South. The College has a 14:1 student-faculty ratio, a campus-wide collaborative approach to learning, an emphasis on leadership, and a nationally recognized honors program. The 87 full-time faculty staff a day program offering 37 majors, 22 minors, and 6 pre-professional programs; an independent Evening College; a Contractual Studies option enabling academically motivated students to design their own program of study; and full NASDTEC accreditation. Columbia College, one of the first Goodlad sites in the NNER, has worked with nine PDSs since 1991 and has a center of pedagogy called the "Alliance of Educators" that involves public school practitioners, arts and sciences faculty, and education faculty in the design of courses and field experiences.

Richland Northeast and Columbia College have been collaborating in the education of educators for over ten years. The relationship began when the RNE math department chair, Janice Brown, and a CC math professor, Lucy Snead, collaborated in the supervision of a math major's student teaching experience. Since this was Snead's first student teacher, she assumed that she was to find an outstanding mentor teacher for her student teacher. After reading *The Mathematics Teacher* journal and noting that Brown was a current Presidential Award Winner for Mathematics Teaching, Snead called Brown and asked if she would supervise a student teacher. Brown refused because several bad experiences had led her to choose never to take another student teacher. Brown later said that Snead's openness about and enthusiasm for her student won Brown over. Brown and Snead met to plan out the clinical work that turned out to be, Brown states, "the most successful student teaching experience I have ever had!"

On the positive side, Brown was energized by the enthusiasm the student teacher brought to the classroom. She was vocal about the advantages of having a well-prepared student teacher in her classroom, providing extra hands and more individual attention for students. Brown quickly enlisted other faculty in her department as well as the school administration in becoming involved with CC student teachers.

On the negative side, Snead had inadvertently overstepped her authority in placing a student teacher. At the time, the official CC policy required a lengthy chain of paperwork from CC to RNE and back again with no face-to-face contact between CC and RNE faculty. Snead heard RNE teachers loudly complaining about this process that gave them no voice in student teacher placement; caused student teachers to show up on the first day without any prior preparation for the experience; and, worst of all, caused names to be lost so that sometimes a student teacher would show up in a teacher's classroom and the latter would not know the former was coming! Snead reported on the respect the RNE teachers felt when they were directly approached about supervision; the support of the principal who appreciated his faculty being treated like professionals; the ownership cooperating teachers and student teachers felt because they had been involved in the process; and, best of all, the communication that the cooperating teachers and student teachers shared long before student teaching began so that the student teacher could literally "hit the ground running."

Clearly, from this brief history one can see that the partnership's beginning was humble–the friendship of two educators. As they met, talked about mutual concerns, and took action, a strong relationship based on trust developed and spread naturally to other math faculty on both campuses. The principal became a strong supporter of this informal partnership and conveyed its existence and results in a joint meeting of both faculties. "These [CC faculty members] are the only people in education I trust. When CC sends us a clinical student, she is well prepared and well supervised and is an additional effective teacher in our classroom." At this same meeting Brown said, "I cannot overemphasize the impact of an additional teacher in my classes giving new explanations and

providing more individual attention for students. Also, having access to CC math faculty has helped my department grow professionally as we seek better ways to help students learn." The principal of a feeder middle school called the College math department asking that CC students work with his students too. Faculty from RNE and CC began presenting results of the informal partnership at state and national conventions. At this time the invitation came from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations and the Institute for Educational Inquiry to apply to be part of the Secondary Partner School Project.

Why did these schools want to engage in inquiry for a year about simultaneous renewal?

Although faculty on both campuses had heard about the results of the now ten-year collaboration between the math departments of RNE and CC, similar collaborative efforts had not spread to other departments and programs. Was the highly departmentalized structure of CC and RNE a wall that could be scaled so that systemic change would result across both sites? The possibility and challenge of this vision was exciting but would require the commitment of people in other departments and positions.

The desire to apply for the AVD grant seemed a logical next step in this informal partnership which was already achieving some significant results. Members of both faculties said, "Why not formalize the conversation between our faculties? Why couldn't we jointly choose an agenda for inquiry into issues of simultaneous renewal? Isn't this the time to invite faculty in other departments to participate? Do we really want to do this? Do we have the people? Do we have the time? Most importantly, how will this conversation translate into good for our public school students?"

The superintendent and CC president met and gave their official support. Secondary education faculty met with arts and sciences faculty at CC and gave their support. The first team meeting took place in April of 1996 with the principal, assistant principal, chairs of the RNE English, math, and science departments, one education faculty, and two arts and sciences faculty in attendance. A subcommittee was formed to outline the inquiry project that eventually consisted of a list of initial guiding questions. The following is a partial listing: Are there other benefits of a partner school relationship for high school faculty and students, college faculty, and secondary teacher education majors? What are the essential elements for the most effective clinical experiences? How might we pursue mutually beneficial staff development experiences?

What did we learn and accomplish?

First, we learned that although the conversation began with a focus on faculties in the English, math, and science departments, other departments and programs and the feeder middle school mentioned above quickly wanted to be involved. Special education faculty saw the need for

secondary majors to learn how to team with special education teachers to meet the needs of mainstreamed students. High school teachers in RNE's new magnet program, InfoLink, wanted help with the integration of technology with all areas of instruction, with staff development, and in sharing technology. [InfoLink is a four-year program designed to provide college prep students with the academic and information literacy skills needed to ensure their success in college and in the information-age workplace of the twenty-first century. The curriculum focuses on four themes deemed crucial to learning about and living in the information age: communications (9th), scientific inquiry (10th), information management (11th), and decisions and society (12th).] A CC history professor had just enrolled her children at RNE and wanted to be involved in the partnership to renew both institutions. Faculty in both modern language departments asked to be involved in the conversation, too.

Second, we learned that scheduling meetings so that everyone who wanted to come could come was a large hurdle. We decided to set the agenda well in advance and use two-period blocks of time. Faculty from both institutions found innovative ways to leave their classes to engage in conversations about renewing education. We discovered new ways to carry on the conversation. A listserve was created, e-mail addresses were exchanged, and phone calls between members of the partnership dramatically increased.

We learned that turnover of personnel is inevitable. In the past two years, RNE has had a new principal, math chair, English chair, and science chair and CC has had a new president and education chair. Upon reflection, the keys to successful transition were openness, excitement, and invitation. The committee said to newcomers, "This is what we have done and hope to do to improve educational opportunities for RNE and CC students. We're excited about mutual professional development and having better educated teachers in our classes as extra professionals. Are you interested in renewing public education and teacher education? If so, please come. We promise you an equal place in our conversation." Because trust had developed between members of the original partnership committee, transitions went smoothly as new players were briefed by job-alikes who were excited about making education better for everyone involved.

We also learned new ways that a partnership could mutually benefit our institutions. RNE faculty asked CC departments to share their expectations for incoming students. Syllabi were exchanged, courses at both institutions were jointly planned, and professional development experiences were designed and conducted. An RNE assistant principal said, "I, as a former English teacher, am especially pleased that we can have college English professors help us set standards for senior students. High school students pay more attention to high school teachers when the teachers can say that they know what colleges expect!" College faculty invited high school practitioners to become equal partners in the planning, supervising, and evaluating of clinical work for secondary majors. A mini-grant gave representatives of both institutions time to establish criteria for the grading

of clinical work, identify expectations and products that would benefit clinical students and public school students, and create job descriptions for clinical students, cooperating teachers, principals, and college supervisors. RNE committed to providing CC student teachers the same orientation to RNE that new faculty received. CC committed to requiring clinical students to help faculty prepare for the opening of school and to begin clinical work at that time. Plans were made for changing clinical work from pass/fail courses to letter-graded courses. A student's work would now be jointly graded by both her cooperating teacher from RNE and her CC supervisor. CC committed to the requirement that each clinical student receive a favorable recommendation from her cooperating teacher before enrolling in the next clinical experience. In short, we now saw our partnership benefiting college students and both faculties in many ways and high school students in some ways.

Practitioners from both institutions made firm commitments to more collaborative efforts in the future. The feeder middle school committed to working with CC faculty in both the clinical work of freshmen and sophomores and in research to discover ways to help female students persist in taking math courses. CC designed a clinical component at this school of a math methods course so that CC students could tutor middle school students in at-risk situations. RNE faculty committed to help supervise the clinical work of all CC juniors and seniors. CC committed to the placement of all secondary methods courses at RNE by the fall of 1998. RNE began changing its policy of accepting only one student teacher per department per year, working toward the placement of many if not all CC student teachers. CC committed to the placement of clinical students only after face-to-face interviews of clinical students, college supervisors, and RNE teachers. During these interviews, clinical work would be individualized to mutually benefit RNE students, the CC student, and the RNE teacher. RNE began planning ways for CC students to be involved in the total school environment by having them trail and interview staff members, observe and participate in many classes, and take part in seminars presented by over a dozen RNE faculty and staff.

Lastly, but very importantly, the relationship grew stronger. More people were trusting and relying on each other and new voices were voicing affirmation about the importance of our partnership. The superintendent said, "In addition to what I view as an improved method for training prospective teachers, I have seen a tremendous training opportunity for our veteran teachers. Our teachers . . . have demonstrated a much higher level of interest in and commitment to being involved in making those decisions that have a profound effect on the teaching and learning process." Members of the partnership steering committee understood the depth of his support when he came ninety minutes late to an afternoon partnership meeting because of district responsibilities and then stayed for an additional sixty minutes of lively discussion, even though he faced an important district board meeting that evening. The CC math chair said, "Our long-standing relationship with RNE has allowed our department to have a significant impact on the total teacher education program at CC. Also, the partnership keeps us accountable because RNE staff members see the results of our teacher

preparation program. They know we see them as equal partners in preparing teachers because they see that their professional judgment has significantly changed the way our students are prepared." A faculty member at the University of South Carolina called the partnership "ground-breaking work in the area of professional development schools. [Snead's] work with Brown . . . not only enhanced the education of CC students but also served as a model for all teacher educators interested in school-based programs." A CC English faculty member said, "The grant has allowed the English departments to develop bonds like those between the math departments. Before the partnership, I had difficulty connecting with cooperating teachers and RNE administrators. Now I have strong professional relationships with many RNE people. Their students and mine all benefit." Snead said, "The difference between the preparation of math teachers before the partnership and after is phenomenal. Previously, I worked with students in a CC classroom studying the theory of teaching, simulating class experiences, and requiring students to practice on each other. Now CC students participate in seminars jointly led by me and RNE staff, learn about the theory, see it implemented by model teachers, and practice it themselves under the mentoring of caring master teachers."

How did we accomplish our task?

The partnership held an informal get-together for both faculties at the beginning of the 1996-97 school year. An overview of the partnership and the NNER was presented along with testimonies by Brown, Snead, and the principal of the value of collaboration to both sites. The principal praised the way CC arts and sciences faculty worked with his faculty in placing clinical students. "Their word can be counted on and they work closely with our faculty in making sure that the clinical work of their well-prepared students begins early in their college careers and is a progression of well-planned experiences. When first approached, I did not think the early placement of preservice teachers was necessary. Now I know that it is a must." Job-alikes met, toured RNE facilities, shared problems and research interests, and decided what they wanted to do next.

Monthly two-hour meetings were scheduled at RNE with a set agenda based on the initial inquiry questions. Although these provided an advance organizer for people's thoughts, the conversations often covered new ground or took us back to an examination of why we entered education in the first place and what the purpose of schooling was. Each meeting was followed by a mailing of detailed minutes of the conversation and the exchange of more ideas through less formal phone calls and e-mails.

Early on in the partnership, we addressed the problems of communication and meeting attendance. Department representatives were responsible for sharing meeting results with their members. When a committee member knew that he or she could not attend, another person was

designated to attend and both briefed and debriefed the absentee about the results of the meeting's conversation into the inquiry questions.

Our chief worrier, Donna Hughes, and another IEI Senior Associate, Dick Clark, visited our sites, attended some of our joint meetings, and provided invaluable feedback. Donna reminded us that we were not to tinker around the edges but to address the renewal of public education and teacher education. She asked, "How do our efforts improve education for RNE students, CC students, both faculties, and others around the nation? Does staff development lead to sounder pedagogy? Are students at both institutions receiving equal access to quality education? Are our efforts morally grounded? Do our efforts make a difference in the strengthening of our democratic way of life?" She commended us on the equal footing of all members of the partnership in the conversation, the openness that characterized our conversations, and the extension of our inquiry into action. Dick highlighted the excitement of and the cooperation between both faculties, complimented us on the expansion of the conversation to new people, and encouraged the exchange of ideas with the partnership between the University of South Carolina and Dreher High School which had also received an Arthur Vining Davis grant.

The joint presentation of the principal, an RNE English teacher, a CC education faculty member, and a CC arts and sciences faculty member at the national AVD team meeting allowed us to express the pride we felt in our inquiry efforts with colleagues from around the nation. As we listened to other grant recipients tell about their progress, we met for several impromptu meetings and both revisited tough questions and brainstormed. We asked, "How can we structure more and better experiences for CC students to work with RNE students? How can we expand the conversation to the fine arts? Is RNE just a clinical site or was it really a professional development school?"

We applied for $500 mini-grants through the Alliance of Educators at Columbia College. One allowed faculties to have a day-long conversation about designing, implementing, and evaluating clinical work so as to benefit both faculties and student bodies. A second allowed English faculties to find new ways to use technology to enhance student learning.

Throughout the year, we became quite candid about our problems and admitted that we could not solve them all in one year. For several reasons, the collaboration between some departments did not materialize. Certainly time conflicts were part of the problem, but interest by several arts and sciences faculty was an issue as well. At this stage, the role of the dean and department chairs was critical. They committed to hiring new arts and sciences faculty who had successful public school experience and who valued the professional development school concept.

In our last meeting of the year we took turns specifically identifying our progress for the entire year, and as a committee gave ourselves permission to be a partnership work in progress. The former has already been mentioned but the impact of the latter is too important to omit. Frankly, we had to honestly face the facts that many secondary partnerships were much farther down the road

than we were, had many more resources than we had yet been able to identify, and had much more time than us to build relationships. These admissions seemed to free us to see the special qualities about our partnership. We were a bottom-up approach to educational renewal that firmly preached and practiced the necessity of equal collaboration among public school faculty, education faculty, and arts and sciences faculty.

What are our next steps?

The success of our partnership depends on the members' continued commitment to simultaneous renewal. Specifically, we look forward to implementing and assessing revisions in the clinical program, developing on-site courses, expanding the partnership to include other departments and programs, establishing other joint inquiry projects, and improving our operations.

The criteria for clinical courses established at the workshop will be used this fall. We plan to monitor the implementation of these criteria carefully and collaboratively throughout the semester and to assess the criteria in a timely manner, allowing for immediate adjustments if necessary. The job descriptions created at the workshop will also be implemented and assessed this fall. Finally, the partnership made a commitment to an interview process involving clinical students, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors in the placement of clinical students. The implementation of this commitment will begin in November with pre-registration for the spring 1998 semester. Assessment of this interview process will take place throughout the 1998 calendar year.

We are particularly excited about opportunities to work collaboratively in designing and teaching on-site courses. The math methods course will again be at RNE this fall, but plans are in place for all secondary methods courses to be at RNE by fall 1998. Some of these courses require a clinical component as a co-requisite and all are now four-hour courses requiring a module in the teaching of reading. These newly configured courses provide ideal opportunities for ongoing collaboration between public school faculty, arts and sciences faculty, and education faculty.

Although we will continue to strengthen ties between the math and English departments, we envision extending the partnership to special education, modern languages, history, science, physical education, dance, and teacher cadets, all of which offer activities, skills, and resources the partnership has identified as important to its success. Plans are being made to include the feeder middle school in CC's Alliance of Educators as a professional development school.

Plans for involving CC faculty as a resource for RNE's new magnet program, InfoLink, are developing. Faculties will collaborate in the design of activities that integrate technology with all areas of instruction, with staff development for new faculty in the program, and with program assessment.

The partnership is committed to identifying meaningful and specific inquiry projects that will be jointly created and implemented by both faculties and that will be presented collaboratively at appropriate professional meetings. Although in the past our inquiry efforts have primarily focused on establishing relationships, brainstorming about various directions the partnership might take, and addressing immediate needs for revising the clinical program, inquiry projects in the upcoming year will offer opportunities for faculty to work in job-alike projects. For example, English faculties believe their conversation about courses in the magnet program will lead to further collaborative inquiry about the role of technology in the teaching of writing and research. A long-term goal of the partnership is the establishment of a variety of in-depth inquiry projects that will enrich and transform the teaching and learning of all involved.

Lastly, but most importantly, our efforts for the coming year will focus on this inquiry: "What can we do to better serve our public school students?" How can CC students be more involved in the mentoring of RNE students? What place can CC students' service learning have at RNE? How can resources, both people and facilities, be shared? How can parents and the public be involved? How can we assess the impact of our partnership? How can we share what we have learned with other high schools and teacher education programs?

In summary, our inquiry efforts will continue as old problems are revisited, new participants are involved in the conversation, and assessment of actions resulting from the previous year's inquiry is discussed. We are still very much a work in progress, but we are convinced that our efforts are more than a blip in current reform efforts. The growth in our partnership is proof of the power of friendship between two educators leading to a quality professional relationship between RNE and CC that is making an impact on education in our city, state, and nation.

The Rocky Mountain High School/Colorado State University PDS: A Way of Being[1]

By Cori Mantle-Bromley, Colorado State University

The Place of Practice

At 7:00 a.m., Judy Elliott, a Colorado State University faculty, rushes from the faculty parking lot to Rocky Mountain High School's (RMHS) front entrance. Large granite boulders and young groves of aspen line the curving path, replicating the nearby foothills of the Rocky Mountains that rise to 14,000 feet in the distance. A lofty 50-foot windowed entrance, lined with trophies and awards, draws students and visitors inward. Elliott passes the new library, hugging the curved glass walls that lead to her classroom. Greeting several Rocky faculty, she continues down the hall to Room 332, permanently labeled as the Professional Development School (PDS) classroom.

Room 332 is where Elliott teaches a university course entitled "Methods of Instruction and Evaluation." Approximately twenty teacher candidates–university students pursuing teacher licensure–take this course during the semester before their final semester of student teaching. The five-credit course includes an internship with a RMHS master teacher and a noon-hour seminar.

Today's 90-minute class starts at 7:30 a.m., twenty minutes earlier than the high school students begin their first classes. The twenty-one teacher candidates (TCs) sit at tables arranged in a circle. Several university and school visitors from Kansas, here to observe a secondary PDS in action, sit in the back of the room.

Elliott begins class: "What's happened in your Rocky classes since we met last?" The professionally dressed students quickly join in the discussion.

One relates an embarrassing moment when she asked her students a question and no one responded. "I got uncomfortable. I just moved on," she confesses.

"Was that a good choice? To go on, I mean?" a fellow TC asks.

"What do you wish you'd done?" asks another. Elliot begins writing their ideas on the board. Soon a list of possible ways to react to the situation fills the chalkboard. The TC who raised the issue nods and jots notes on a pad.

They move on. Another TC, John, says his Rocky students treat him as if he were one of them. It makes him feel sometimes that they don't take him seriously. A TC asks John, "So, do you talk to them the way you were just talking to us?" Puzzled, John nods. "Then no wonder! You're treating them too informally. You need to assert yourself in your language."

"I never thought of that. You're probably right," John says. After a few minutes of discussion, he agrees with his peers. He may have unintentionally sent messages to students by the way he talks and by his posture and actions.

Judy Elliott interrupts the discussion to ask who will be teaching in their Rocky classes today. Three TCs raise their hands. They have each prepared lessons for today's 90-minute second period. "Who can observe?" asks Elliott. It takes about five minutes to decide which of the other TCs can observe in each of the three classes.

For the remaining 40 minutes of their class time, pairs of TCs present strategies they designed, created to elicit more student participation in discussions. They had earlier agreed this was generally a weak spot in their teaching. Elliott turns to the Kansas observers. "As they get teaching experience in the classroom," she says, "it always makes them realize that they need more ideas." The TCs write down each other's strategies and make suggestions to enhance others' ideas. By the end of the forty minutes, they're half joking that their work should be published. "They're definitely good enough," encourages Elliott.

Now there are only five minutes remaining before the TCs begin working in their assigned Rocky classes. Noticeably, the atmosphere begins to stiffen. TCs gather up materials. Two leave early, on today's roster to serve hall duty. Another tries to catch Judy Elliott's attention for a personal question. Elliott, too, is gathering her own materials. She answers a question, then signals to a university colleague, Val Middleton, who just walked in.

Middleton is the second university faculty, also working at RMHS. She and Elliott move to a corner. Their voices lower and they both frown uncharacteristically. They're discussing their mutual concern about a teacher candidate, Lew. They decide that this morning Middleton will take on observing Lew and Elliott will observe two other TCs' lessons. Middleton will have three TC observers with her. They step into the hall, merging with a steady stream of students flowing in and out of hallways and classrooms. Elliott watches them disappear and then turns back to her Kansas visitors.

They are brimming with questions. They ask Elliott whether the university class she teaches has changed since it was moved from the university to Rocky. She nods her head vigorously.

"Nothing is the same." She pauses. "Well, that's not entirely true. The topics are the same. But everything else–the strategies, how the course is delivered–is totally different." She looks directly at them. "No one talks much about this. Discussion in the PDS literature is that the PDS students benefit and the teachers benefit. But it's the university people who really get renewed! You know, I'm doing the best teaching I've ever done. And that's every semester. I get better and better, and it's because we keep trying new things. We're constantly looking for ways to improve–sharing, pushing each other. Here everyone is a learner. And the PDS students are helping me learn. They see me in

that light, as a fellow learner. We talk together, about getting better." Elliot looks up at the clock and takes a sharp breath. "Sorry, gotta go." She heads for the door.

Through a maze of burnt-orange brick hallways stands the door to the geography classroom. Teacher candidate Tom has just completed his lesson. It's 10:00 a.m. Rocky students work independently, occasionally discussing Tom's assignment with the regular classroom teacher. The two TCs who observed Tom move with him into the hall. They discuss a student who challenged Tom by talking throughout the lesson. Tom responds: "His questions and comments are on task, but he's not listening to me. I don't want to stop him from thinking. But at the same time, he's distracting the other students." The observers ask, "Have you talked with the other students? Is he a bother to them? Or is he helping? That's what you need to find out."

Tom, tall and athletic, nods. He fidgets with a slip of paper. "There's another thing. I didn't know this material as well as I've known other material." The observers tell him he appeared confident, that they couldn't see that he was uncomfortable with the content. Tom shrugs. Then his face brightens. "Hey, you know what? While I was up there, I thought of the perfect activity. A different way to teach this. I know how I'm going to do this next time!"

Down another brick hallway, in Room 406, Rocky history students are arranged in small groups. Teacher candidate Lew occasionally monitors their work, but mostly he socializes with one group of students. At 10:15, several students try unsuccessfully to get his attention. By 10:30, the students have given up and are not even pretending interest in the task. The regular teacher, Kurt Knierim, moves in and out of the classroom door, unobtrusively weaving between student desks. He answers questions, clarifies the task, and sends concerned glances back to Val Middleton, watching from the back of the room.

After the class leaves, the TC observers, along with Middleton and Knierim, sit down with Lew. "What was going on?" asks Middleton. The TCs' responses are candid. Lew admits that he spent only thirty minutes preparing for the class. A teacher candidate wrinkles her brow, saying, "Mr. Knierim is going to have to fill in your holes tomorrow. I've seen you process, Lew. Thirty minutes isn't enough time." Another TC describes how she teaches her cat everything she is going to teach the next day. "I'm better after I do it a few times. You might try something like that."

The conversation moves to fixing what they all agree was a bad lesson. The group brainstorms ways to handle this. First of all, Lew sees the need to apologize to the students, to tell them that his lesson did not prepare them as much as they need to be prepared. The observers try to get him to be positive, to learn from his experience. "You were smiling and positive, even when you saw it wasn't working. At least you didn't have a defeatist attitude."

A TC raises another concern: "The students are having difficulty telling when you're serious and when you aren't, Lew." Lew looks at the floor. "I can do better," he says. His eyes grow moist. Knierim puts his hand on Lew's shoulder saying, "You'll get it." The TCs and Middleton gather their

materials and walk down near-empty halls to the PDS classroom, where their noon-hour seminar has already begun.

Three Rocky teachers sit among the TCs, in as much of a circle as the tables' straight lines permit. The teachers have volunteered their lunch hour to talk about student apathy. The teachers are sharing stories about what works for them, when one enthusiastically jabs the air with his index finger: "We're talking about students feeling connected. Being involved. Actively participating."

A TC haltingly follows with a question: "Do you take it personally when students react poorly to your teaching? Does it bother you?"

"Absolutely," the English teacher and coach responds. "It's what makes you a good teacher. Constantly looking. You personalize it. And keep looking for ways to make it better."

The math teacher nods. "I think you should personalize it. Keep looking for ways to reach that kid. It's not unusual to lose sleep. If you're not connected, if you don't care, it'll get worse."

Elliott is sitting in the back of the classroom with the Kansas visitors, who continue to ask hows and whys of the Rocky PDS. Elliot explains that teachers' PDS participation often extends far beyond mentoring in the classroom. She lists various activities: this semester alone, over twenty Rocky teachers have volunteered their lunch time to discuss topics at the noon-hour seminars. The Special Needs Department has rearranged one teacher's schedule so that she can teach in the PDS class. Those teachers currently mentoring a TC or working with a student teacher also attend reflective seminars each month, discussing course content from the university methods course, sharing ideas, discussing readings, and brainstorming solutions to problems. The school's administrators join the teachers and university faculty for the seminars. And the administrators also teach in the PDS methods class. This semester, the three associate principals team-taught a unit on school law.

As third period approaches, the TCs thank the teachers for their time. The teachers enter the cacophony of student voices passing through the halls. The TCs, visibly tired, wait until the halls clear. In smaller groups, they wind their way back around the curved glass of the counselors' offices. They visit momentarily in the student commons area where more giant granite boulders, speckled with maroon and gray, rise as sentinels from the blue and gray floor tiles.

At 3:30 p.m., the same protective boulders greet four Rocky teachers, a student teacher, and three university faculty as they pass through the commons area into the main office conference room. The windowless interior room, long and narrow, shuts out the frenetic pace of the outer halls as students leave the building. Cushioned chairs and soft carpet hush voices and invite relaxation. The group is joined by the RMHS principal, Karen Dixon, for the monthly PDS advisory meeting.

Nearly everyone present adds an item to the agenda. Elliott wants to discuss piloting a new student teaching model and she additionally proposes that the second semester student teachers formally mentor the incoming teacher candidates. Principal Dixon asks the group to think about how

the PDS should be connected to the school's governance. Teachers raise several possibilities: "It's the PDS that's the catalyst for all the staff development in the building. Maybe we should merge with the staff development committee." Another teacher stares beyond her colleagues to the gray walls, "The PDS transcends them [the standing committees] all," she says. "It is climate, it is curriculum, it is staff development."

Dixon also wants to discuss who, other than she, should chair the advisory meetings. "I don't want to control the agenda and our direction." French teacher Liz Urban, concerned about the school's action research project, wants to discuss ways to improve the process. Student teacher Jim is not sure he's been a valuable addition to the group. "Just as I'm figuring out how everything works, it's time for me to leave and for someone new to join." For over an hour, the team discusses the agenda items. Rejecting the adequacy of the status quo, they often mention "the next level" of their work.

At 5:00 p.m., the meeting adjourns. Two Rocky teachers remain in the conference room to talk with the university researcher studying the Rocky PDS. The three are continuing an earlier conversation about benefits of the PDS. Tom List, a social studies teacher, regularly works with PDS students and student teachers. List leans forward. "I wasn't ever at a worthwhile professional conference prior to PDS. But now, the opportunities are coming fast and furious. The cross-school conversations are real valuable. Talking to other schools' teachers who have answers to problems we face–incredible! And the work with content area professors–for the first time ever, this partnership has presented classroom teachers opportunities to meet with colleagues at the university level in our content areas."

Art teacher Rick Takahashi nods. "I feel comfortable coming to Val (university supervisor Middleton) and asking her to watch what I'm doing. We have that kind of professionalism." He hesitates, searching for words. "It helps me get better. The PDS has broken down the isolation. You see PDS students admit not knowing everything. We see that. We're more willing to ask for ideas."

At 6:00 p.m., the conference room door closes. The three colleagues walk toward the student commons area. Light boxes the floor outside the principals' offices. Cheerleaders' feet tap the floor in unison as they chant a new drill. The sanitary, slightly antiseptic smell of wax wafts its way from the hall where a custodian wrestles a heavy machine. The floors have to be shiny for tomorrow's 1,500 high school students, 75 high school faculty and staff, 20 university teacher candidates, 10 student teachers, and 2 university faculty.

Serving Tea

There is a centuries old Japanese practice of serving tea, called Cha-no-yu, that requires a lifetime of dedication and commitment. Its values include simplicity, balance, response to the needs

of others, and intense awareness of one's self. "The student of Tea," says tea master Sen, "learns to arrange things, to understand timing and interludes, to appreciate social graces, and to apply all of these to daily experience. These things are all brought to bear in the simple process of serving and receiving a bowl of tea and are done with a single purpose–to realize tranquility of mind in communion with one's fellow men" (1989, p.9).[2]

The actual practice of lifelong study is rare in any culture. Experts in any field, however, are rarely satisfied with their current skills and knowledge. The chess champion, the concert pianist, the Olympic athlete all dedicate great periods of time to practice and reflection. And they know that even maintaining their current levels of mastery requires intense dedication and focus.

Contrast the ceremonial tradition of serving tea, rich in highly contextualized and anticipated movements, to the newly emerging phenomenon of the professional development school. The PDS purpose, too, is singular–the improvement of teaching and learning. Yet its students, the participants of the professional development school, have no master from whom to learn. There is no clear model to emulate, no book of wisdom that hints of answers to difficult questions, no tradition to ponder. And still, the learners in such ventures strive to understand more fully the acts of teaching and learning, with the belief that their work will improve and that students will ultimately benefit. The professional development school model suggests this possibility of lifelong focus on teaching and learning.

One such professional development school venture, the Rocky Mountain High School/Colorado State University PDS, is in its fourth year.[3] Its participants strive to achieve the high standards for school/university partnerships set forth by the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER): (a) providing exemplary education for all students; (b) preparing exemplary teachers; (c) providing continuing education for all professionals; and (d) conducting inquiry into educational practice.[4]

One day's visit to the RMHS/CSU partner school[5] illustrates the potential of a PDS in becoming, as the tea master would say, "a way of being" for its participants. The PDS, in French teacher Urban's words, "transcends" both Rocky Mountain High School and Colorado State University. It is becoming a way of thinking about teaching and learning and a way of involving everyone in the process. This potential can be seen in four interrelated ways:

- **Permanency.** The RMHS/CSU PDS has continued its work even after two key leaders (one from the university and the other from RMHS) moved on. The university faculty at RMHS has a permanent classroom designated as the official PDS space. School faculty members see the PDS influencing multiple aspects of the school–from the school's environment to its teachers' professional development. And perhaps most important, it is not just a few RMHS

faculty who are involved. Nearly all the eighty-plus faculty, including administrators, has participated in some aspect of the PDS.

- **High Expectations.** University students looked and acted like school professionals. They respectfully challenged and supported each other. Teachers demonstrated high expectations for both the university students and themselves. Elliott was focused on constant improvement of herself, her students, and the PDS structure. The advisory meeting topics demonstrated an expectation that the PDS work would improve.

- **A Learning Community.** Elliott attributed improvements in her teaching to her university students and her RMHS colleagues. The TCs demonstrated high levels of learning, from both the university faculty and RMHS faculty, but also from each other. They listened carefully to their peers' experiences and recommendations. And RMHS faculty eagerly talked about learning from the university students and from the university faculty.

- **A Process.** The PDS is seen by its participants as a process of continual improvement. As much conversation occurred about "the next level" of their work as occurred about the present. Elliott is searching for a new model of student teaching. Rocky faculty members wonder about governance issues and different ways to involve themselves in action research. The principal wants to expand leadership and ownership.

For its participants, the RMHS/CSU PDS has become their place of practice, the place where they can recognize their current expertise and contributions, and then safely and confidently work at improving.

Insufficiency

Tea Master Sen suggests that recognition of weakness or imperfection is one more positive step in the process of becoming better. "Contrary to the belief that insufficiency is a source of discontent," he says, "Tea seizes that very insufficiency and builds upon it" (Sen, 1989, p. 77). PDS participants and stakeholders of the Rocky PDS have a similar view. While they agree that good things are happening at Rocky, they also agree that Rocky's progress brings with it both dilemmas and constant recognition that more is possible. No one claims satisfaction. And discussion about "the next level of the partnership" is common. The concerns and questions, however, change as one's perspective changes.

The university's School of Education director worries about people and money resources: "PDSs don't create great numbers of FTE.[5] We are a small faculty. We try to have two faculty involved at each PDS. That is very labor intensive and stretches us thin. I'm worried about how we keep our model afloat with the resources we have." He worries about the lack of involvement from arts and sciences faculty and, additionally, about the political need to share resources equally across all of the PDS sites.

A dean from the College of Liberal Arts applauds the progress at Rocky. He too, however, sees the noticeable lack of systematic involvement of arts and sciences faculty. "We all know that the PDS model is built around a three-party partnership: the schools, colleges/schools of education, and the arts and sciences. For a wide variety of reasons," he continues, "the creation of actual partnerships has been overwhelmingly two-party affairs rather than three. The Rocky example is representative. There is a healthy and significant partnership, but it is two-party, not three."

The superintendent of the school district is concerned with the potential conflict between the district's mission, clearly stated as serving K-12 students, and the amount of time and effort spent on preparing new teachers at the PDS sites. "This is a compelling reason for us to talk about our mission being K-16," he says. A second concern of the superintendent's is a political reality. "I continue to get pressure from other universities to place students in our district. They're starting to feel like they're shut out of our district."

A second administrator, one heavily involved in partnership activities, returns to the issue of resources: "At both the district and the university levels, how do you find resources for as much activity as people are asking for? What will the district provide? How do we make people's visions happen?"

Rocky's principal continues to puzzle over the issue raised at the advisory meeting. "One real dilemma is the governance issue. Once PDS takes hold, it becomes what you are. What group monitors and revisits the vision? PDS has become our staff development. But because no one representing the PDS is a part of the decision-making process, we don't allocate money for it. Grants have allowed us to do some things. But the staff development committee is not in tune with the vision for PDS. The site-based management system we put together two years ago met our needs then. But now, at a different level of PDS involvement, we have to figure out how the PDS relates to the governance of the school."

The principal also questions how to advance school ownership of the PDS vision. "It's so complicated. Not everyone gets the big picture. It's the intense conversations. When people are drawn away from their day-to-day concerns--that creates the bigger understanding."

When Rocky teacher List talks about his concerns, his shoulders sag and his head lowers. "I'm struggling. Struggling to find time. Time to take advantage of everything our partnership has made available to me."

University faculty Middleton worries too. "I spend a lot of time at Rocky. Developing relationships at Rocky. Which are very good. But, back at CSU, I've lost touch with what's going on with my peers. And to some extent my other students. I don't see them in the halls. I don't have the same connection at CSU anymore. I'm hardly ever there."

These questions and dilemmas were not being raised four years ago. They reflect the university's institutionalization of the PDS semester, expanding from one experimental PDS in the district, Rocky, to three, with a fourth being added soon. They reflect increased district expectations of collaboration and higher levels of cross-institutional trust than previously experienced. They represent some of the challenges Rocky and CSU face and must solve together if they are to continue learning together.

The dilemmas that face RMHS and the Teacher Licensure Program, as well as the school district and CSU's School of Education and arts and sciences faculty, represent new challenges that were not recognized four years ago. These challenges, resulting from previously unexperienced relationships, represent future possibilities.

A Beginning

The Rocky Mountain High School/Colorado State partnership has, from its participants' perspectives, made great strides in four years. Faculty members have formed close working relationships across institutional boundaries. Small grants have created joint professional development opportunities for school and university faculty and university students. And the concept "community of learners" now means a great deal to the PDS participants. Teacher candidates, for example, see themselves as both learners and teachers. Rocky faculty recognize their own expertise and experience, but also talk about relearning concepts they had forgotten and learning new ideas and approaches from the university students. And the university faculty members claim they have learned more than anyone else, totally changing the ways they teach and integrate theory and practice. Even Rocky high school students regularly coach the prospective teachers, taking them aside to suggest ways of fixing something that did not work so well.

The "pupils" in this venture–public school and university administrators, faculty, and students–have learned a great deal. They have learned the importance of relationships and have begun to appreciate the long and steep journey ahead. And they have been rewarded by seeing their work improve. Together, they have begun the focused, daily practice of intentionally focusing on the art of teaching in its authentic context. This intense awareness of one's self and one's actions in relation to teaching others has great potential for improving teaching and learning. Rocky PDS participants become like the lifelong students of Tea, who accept that they will never stop learning. The PDS provides opportunity for learning as a way of being.

By participating in the Rocky PDS, these learners bring increased understandings of self and others to the seemingly simple act of teaching a student. They are learning what James P. Carse[7] concluded as he studied the extraordinary in ordinary experience: "Every step on our journey adds to what we know but it also reveals there is no end to knowing" (1994, p. xi).

Notes

1. This writing was supported by funding from the Institute for Educational Inquiry and the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations.

2. References to the Japanese tea ceremony are taken from a book entitled, *Tea Life, Tea Mind*. It was written by Grand Tea Master XV, Soshitsu Sen, of the Urasenke School of Tea. In its seventh printing, this book was first published by Weatherhill (New York) in 1979. Tea Master Sen explains a way of life, which is based on principles of the tea ceremony called, *Chado, the Way of Tea*.

3. It is difficult to establish an exact date that the CSU/RMHS partnership began. Informal conversations, friendships, and joint projects led to formal discussions, which began during the 1992-93 school year. Nancy Hartley, then director of the School of Education, talked with the school district superintendent, Don Unger, and Karen Dixon, RMHS principal, about forming a collaborative partnership.

   Soon after, a retreat was arranged. Faculty and administrators from RMHS joined faculty, administrators, and student teachers from CSU to talk about visions of teaching and learning and ask questions: What could we do together that we couldn't do apart? In what ways could our collaboration provide mutual benefit? By the end of the day, the forty-plus attendees of the meeting were enthusiastic about possibilities and committed to talking to more people. Conversations continued throughout the year and by the fall of 1993 the first cohort of twenty-two CSU teacher candidates began taking coursework on the RMHS campus.

   Every Tuesday and Thursday, the CSU faculty and students are on the RMHS campus. The students participate in a 90-minute theories class (which is often co-taught by RMHS faculty and administrators), work with departments and teachers in classrooms for a 90-minute block, and then return to a seminar to debrief classroom experiences and connect the earlier theory to practice. From this group of approximately twenty pre-student-teaching teacher candidates, the RMHS faculty select a maximum of ten teacher candidates to continue at RMHS for their final semester–student teaching. For results of a study that compared the beliefs and experiences of the teacher candidates at RMHS to those taking the methods course

on campus, see the article by Blocker, L. S., & Mantle-Bromley, C. (in press): "PDS vs. Campus Preparation: Through the Eyes of the Students," in *The Teacher Educator*.

4. School/university partner schools in the NNER share a commitment to John I. Goodlad's 19 postulates, described in *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994). A total of 16 NNER settings embrace 34 colleges and universities, over 100 school districts, and more than 400 partner schools. For more information regarding the four functions of a partner school, see the NNER *Compact for Educational Renewal*, written by Richard Clark.

5. Data for this RMHS/CSU portrait was actually collected during two days of observation (April 24 and May 1, 1997) by the author. All quotes are verbatim, except for very minor editing for clarification. The actual context of the quotations is taken from detailed notes. Quotations from the "Insufficiency" section are from individual interviews conducted over a period of several weeks in the spring of 1997. Names of professionals have not been changed. University teacher candidate names have been changed.

6. Student credit generated per faculty load.

7. James P. Carse writes about seeing and understanding the universe through everyday experience. His book, *Breakfast at the Victory: The Mysticism of Ordinary Experience* (San Francisco: Harper, 1994), serves to remind PDS participants that their experiences, if paid attention to, have the potential of revealing extraordinary understandings.

Roosevelt High School Portrait of a Partnership with Harris-Stowe State College and Maryville University

By Nancy Williams, Maryville University

Defining Terms

Partnership: When two or more parties establish a mutually beneficial relationship.

The Question: What happens when three diverse populations enter into a partnership when the parties have little prior knowledge and or experience with each other?

The Partners

Roosevelt High School opened its doors February 2, 1925, as a neighborhood school that served the predominately German population on the south side of St. Louis. Its motto was and remains, "Striving to provide the best training and educational experiences possible for its students." It was designed to accommodate enrollments of up to 2,800 students. Roosevelt continued operating as a neighborhood school until 1981 when the St. Louis Public Schools came under a desegregation order. Shortly thereafter, African-American students were bussed from the north side of St. Louis (more ethnically African- American) in order to integrate the all-white school. In the ensuing years, magnet schools were created in the district, the neighborhood around Roosevelt became integrated, and bussing was no longer necessary to achieve racial balance. Today, Roosevelt High School is one of twelve high schools in the St. Louis Public Schools. It is one of four non-magnet or general high schools and it is the only non-magnet high school considered naturally integrated. This is significant in that naturally integrated schools, because of the court order surrounding desegregation, have the least allocations of resources in the district. At the close of the 1996-97 school year, the student population was classified 75 percent African-American, 17 percent Caucasian, 6 percent Asian, and 2 percent Hispanic.

One of the greatest challenges today at Roosevelt is servicing a constantly changing population. For example, at the beginning of the 1996-97 school year, 1,493 students were enrolled. By spring, only 1,017 students were enrolled. However, from September until June, 1,327 students were withdrawn. Indeed, only 109 students who enrolled the first week of school completed the year without ever having been withdrawn. This turnover can be attributed to a highly mobile population, a high dropout rate, disciplinary transfers and expulsions, acceptance of students into

magnet schools, acceptance of students into other school districts as part of the voluntary transfer (desegregation) program, and students returning to school after a prolonged absence. The result is that the composition of most classes is in constant flux. This, combined with sometimes poor attendance patterns of those students who are enrolled, is often a challenging factor for faculty as they plan for and deliver instruction.

Enrollment at Roosevelt could be termed "bottom heavy." Freshman classes average in the mid-500s, while senior classes average in the mid-100s. In June 1997, 164 seniors graduated. Just under 30 percent of those students enrolled at Roosevelt as freshmen, more evidence of the mobility factor.

Another factor that shapes the character of Roosevelt is that over 25 percent of the population is enrolled in special education classes. These students are enrolled in resource classes, self- contained learning disabled/behavior disordered classes, or STEP (Students Towards Employment Program) classes. The special education department is the largest in the building, claiming 27 of the 84 teaching positions last year. There are strong academic opportunities for students. A number of students earn college credit in Advanced Placement classes in English Literature, German, and American History. Next year, psychology will be added to the list of Advanced Placement classes, in part because of resources provided through this partnership.

Roosevelt is situated in an ethnically rich area. Because of this and its English as a Second Language program, the school is very diverse. In June of 1997, 12 percent of the school was designated ESL. Many countries like Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia are represented, with the largest group coming from Vietnam. Many of these students and others from Roosevelt are from low-income families. One measure of this is that 70 percent of the population receives free or subsidized lunches.

Roosevelt shares the problems faced by most large, urban high schools today. Roosevelt is no stranger to drugs, violence, teen pregnancy, poor attendance, and apathy. Students enter school through metal detectors and are subjected to searches of their bags and persons. Video cameras and security guards are also a part of the Roosevelt environment. But, in essence, there is little violence in the school itself and the building for many is a beacon of hope and a place where one will find many dedicated educators. There are many programs in place that do work and many of the students do succeed. For example, Roosevelt's Vocal Jazz Ensemble, under the direction of Mr. Dello Thedford, performs at events throughout the city and is recognized for its excellence. Roosevelt students have placed first in the citywide math contest three times in the last four years. Students enter and win awards in the St. Louis Post Dispatch Science Fair each year. Every year, students earn money to participate in a Close-Up trip to Washington, DC; in 1996-97, eight students made the trip. Furthermore, many students participate in speech and drama events, mock trials, dances, sports,

band performances, the German club, the Garden Club, cheerleading activities, and student council. While there is not a computer in every room, technology is a part of the Roosevelt experience.

New in the 1996-97 school year was a $90,000 Distance Learning Lab. This lab is equipped with monitors, cameras, a VCR, and microphones. It allows classes to be taught simultaneously at Roosevelt and other sites in the district. This year, German was taught at Roosevelt to a group of thirty-four Roosevelt students and four students at Vashon High School, another school in the district. Another district school shared calculus with Roosevelt via technology. Roosevelt also has three new computer labs, one used for business classes and two open to teachers for other classes. Internet access will be the next step at Roosevelt.

The faculty is almost as diverse as the student body. One common factor that crosses race, gender, and ethnic diversity, however, is that the Roosevelt faculty is aging. In some cases, the faculty members are out on sick leave and must substitutes in their place. It is often difficult to secure qualified substitutes for both those teachers on leave and those who may miss only a day or two. A majority of teachers are within five or six years of retiring. This is due primarily to layoffs by seniority that occurred when the district lost thousands of students to county districts through court ordered desegregation. It is just within the past few years that new, younger teachers have begun to replenish the ranks as senior faculty members retire. The majority of older faculty remains dedicated to the task of educating their students despite the many challenges. They are a group who has experienced many changes in the last few years, yet has endured.

Indeed, there have been many changes in the last ten years. In 1991, Soldan High School's staff and students were blended into Roosevelt while they awaited a renovation of the Soldan building. This blending was sometimes difficult. In 1993, when the Soldan renovation was completed, applications were accepted district-wide to staff the school. A number of Roosevelt faculty, many of whom had been on the faculty for up to thirty years, applied for and got jobs at Soldan. At this time, Roosevelt lost its previously held International Studies Magnet component to Soldan, a school-within-a-school program believed to attract academically talented students. At the same time, Roosevelt also lost the Air Force ROTC to Soldan. There was a sense of loss among the faculty at Roosevelt about these changes.

Roosevelt has also coped with many changes in administration. Principals and assistant principals have come and gone. In the last ten years, Roosevelt has had four principals and one acting principal. This fall, Roosevelt will begin the year with its third principal in the last year.

As an urban high school, Roosevelt has a rich history; it has served this ethnically diverse area well. It currently has a core of dedicated but aging faculty members who are striving to deal with the primary problems of mobility among students, limited resources, and turnovers in administration.

Harris-Stowe State College has a rich and continued history in the St. Louis region, reaching back 140 years. In 1857, Harris Teachers College was founded as the first public teacher-preparation institution west of the Mississippi, and in 1891 Stowe Teachers College was established. The two institutions, which comprised an arm of the St. Louis Public Schools, prepared white and black teachers respectively for the public schools of St. Louis. In 1954, the two colleges merged into one institution, making it the first fully integrated unit of the St. Louis Public Schools. It continued as a city teachers college until 1979 when it entered the Missouri system of state colleges and universities.

Since its inception, Harris-Stowe has been located in the city core; it continues to have an urban base and commitment. The College is a coeducational commuter college with no branches. Its original mission of preparing competent teachers for elementary schools in the City of St. Louis was broadened in 1986 to include early childhood, elementary, and middle-level preparation, and in 1993 to include secondary teacher education.

Harris-Stowe State College currently averages an enrollment of 1,700 students. In the spring of 1997, the Department of Education had approximated 350 full-time and 320 part-time students. Of that number, 68 were full time in secondary education, while 92 were part time. The authorization for a secondary program at Harris-Stowe is only a few years old. The College employs 46 full-time faculty members; the Department of Education has 19 full-time faculty. There are many adjuncts from the St. Louis Public Schools. Students at Harris-Stowe State College are enrolled in NCATE-accredited undergraduate programming.

Maryville University began its tradition in St. Louis City in 1872 as a Catholic women's college. One of the oldest private institutions in the St. Louis area, Maryville was originally an academy for young women and was located in the heart of South St. Louis. The academy evolved into a junior college and became a four-year college in 1923.

Maryville moved to its current location in West St. Louis County in 1961 and became Maryville University of St. Louis in 1991. Maryville University has become a community-based, independent, coeducational liberal arts institution with a mission to blend the liberal arts with professional programs in education, business, and health careers.

The School of Education at Maryville offers a wide variety of undergraduate programs leading to certification in early childhood, elementary, and middle-level education. The secondary certification program, collaboratively redesigned in 1994-95 with high school faculty and staff, is now a post-baccalaureate program.

Maryville averages an enrollment of 3,200 students. The School of Education (SOE) enrolls students in both undergraduate and graduate programming. The SOE programs have been accredited by NCATE. In the spring of 1997, 400 students were enrolled in classes in the School of Education–100 undergraduate students (mostly full time) and 300 graduate students (mostly part time). There were 11 full-time faculty members and administrators in the School of Education in 1996-97.

The Beginnings of Partnership

Harris-Stowe State College and Maryville University have been working together since 1993 when they applied together to become members of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). To join the NNER, they formed a collaborative called the Metropolitan St. Louis Consortium for Educational Renewal which includes the two higher education institutions and their partner schools. Before that time, there had been no real professional collaboration between the teacher education units of these institutions even though both had begun partnerships with elementary schools and both had individual renewal agendas for themselves and those other elementary schools. As part of their goals with the Consortium, Harris-Stowe and Maryville have begun to collaborate in some areas of their programming in an effort to enhance the renewal agenda. This has begun in the early childhood program and is advancing to the middle-level area. As part of their mission with the NNER, both institutions expressed interest in working with an urban high school. The St. Louis Public Schools suggested collaboration with Roosevelt High School and the then-principal of Roosevelt, Tom Daly, agreed to the arrangement with his school.

Previously, Tom Daly had been working with Emelda Harris from Harris-Stowe on a summer Academy for College Preparation for eighth-grade students coming into Roosevelt. This Academy, though delivered at Harris-Stowe, was facilitated by Roosevelt teachers in tandem with Harris-Stowe faculty. The goal of the program was to help students who had demonstrated potential for success make a positive transition into Roosevelt. This program was delivered in the summers of 1995 and 1996. In 1995, sixteen Roosevelt students were served; in 1996, eighteen students participated in the program. Though it has been changed, this program served as a beginning step for Harris-Stowe State College's involvement with Roosevelt. In the spring of 1997, students from Harris-Stowe's secondary program were placed at Roosevelt as part of a reading class requirement. These Harris-Stowe programs were designed and delivered by Harris-Stowe faculty and staff.

In the summer of 1995, faculty members from Maryville University and Parkway South High School were putting the finishing touches on a new secondary teacher education program. This jointly planned post-baccalaureate program was to be delivered over the course of fifteen months and involve much work at Parkway South. One module of the program, however, was designed to be delivered in a more diverse, urban setting. After securing permission from Principal Daly to place students in Roosevelt in the fall of 1996, teachers from Roosevelt (Mary Weber, English, and Larry Versey, math) attended a meeting of the program design team to discuss some of the possibilities for placing Maryville students at Roosevelt. And indeed, in the fall of 1996, nine students from the Maryville University Masters in Secondary Teaching and Inquiry were placed at Roosevelt High School.

At this point there were three partners, but each institution of higher education had worked with its own program with Roosevelt. In the summer of 1996, through the application process for the Arthur Vining Davis Secondary Partner School Project, all partners saw the potential of creating goals that would help us establish a "communication and governance" structure and design programs that would bring these three diverse groups together to work toward simultaneous renewal. The tripartite membership met in October 1996 at Maryville as a joint group to do some of the initial planning and again in November at Roosevelt when the Institute for Educational Inquiry advisor visit was held. Faculty and staff from all partners were in attendance at these meetings. Three broad goals were established for the 1996-97 school year. These goals were to establish a collaborative, long-range plan that would extend the conversation with our secondary partners and continue the process of engaging all partners in simultaneous renewal; to extend the dialogue about teaching and learning; and to provide support for Roosevelt teachers to join teachers from Parkway South in a leadership program focusing on high school issues.

In October 1996, the Roosevelt principal, Tom Daly, unexpectedly left the building because of health concerns. Gene Gladstone, an assistant principal at Roosevelt who then knew very little about the partnership, was named acting principal. It should also be mentioned that at the same time, the St. Louis Public Schools had a new superintendent who was under a Board directive to reorganize and re-prioritize within the district. In the spring, Mr. Gladstone was affirmed in his leadership and named principal of Roosevelt. He was open to dialogue about partnership.

The change in leadership caused regrouping throughout the fall, but the nature of the partnership also contributed to the awkward beginning. We were three very different groups from three different "cultures" beginning to work with each other. We had few previous lines of communication. One might imagine a freshman dance where students from different "feeder schools" all look at each other and wonder what the other is all about. Nobody wanted to take initiative for fear of being seen as aggressive. Scheduling the next "dance" was difficult because each person involved had many and diverse obligations. Communication within groups was possible, between two partners was a little more difficult, but among the three was an incredible challenge. The challenge was perhaps greatest for faculty at Roosevelt who also had to figure out all of the new acronyms and their meanings and implications for them (PDS, PDSC, NNER, AVD, translating to Professional Development School, PDS Collaborative, National Network for Educational Renewal, and Arthur Vining Davis!). Also, because some of our first initiatives engaged only two of the partners, Roosevelt faculty and staff were sometimes confused about the nature of the three-way partnership. This confusion was justified.

Consequently, in the spring of 1997, the chairperson of the Department of Education at Harris-Stowe, Dr. Nancy Gammon, and the dean of the School of Education at Maryville, Dr. Mary Ellen Finch, met with Mr. Gladstone to recommit to the mission. Mr. Gladstone affirmed his strong

commitment to continue with the project. We thought perhaps we were ready to move to the second verse of "Getting to Know You" when we learned, early in the summer of 1997, that Gene Gladstone had decided to retire to take another position in another district.

The Relationship: Goals and Observations of the Year

Three goals were established for this year by the group that met in October 1996. These goals, some of the intended outcomes, the results, and comments about lessons learned follow.

- **Goal #1: To develop a collaborative, long-range plan that will extend the conversation with our secondary school partners and continue the process of engaging all partners in simultaneous renewal.**

Inherent in the goal above was the need to develop a form of governance, to set and hold regular meetings, to broaden the commitment from constituents, to connect with teachers in the building–all in an effort to create a long-range plan.

The initial AVD meeting was held in October, with meetings following in November, December, January, February, and April. It took much of this time for the partners to get to know each other and to identify procedures for communication. We have tried e-mail, but some partners are not yet connected. Some partners at Harris-Stowe and Maryville are connected, but we are still working to activate the link with Roosevelt. The hardware and software are there; we need the appropriate phone line to make quick communication possible.

Because no one person volunteered or was designated chairperson for the group, some initial confusion existed about who could and would call meetings and establish the agenda. This was not for want of mission for the project, but probably out of deference for the other. In March 1997, Dr. Keith Trautwein from Harris-Stowe assumed the role of meeting convener.

There was initial confusion among the Roosevelt staff about the nature of the partnership. The trip to Phoenix in February 1997 really helped to clarify for those attending the potential held by collaboration. Constituents from Roosevelt and the St. Louis Public Schools benefited greatly from their dialogues with teachers from other schools. They especially enjoyed their discussions with teachers from Aiken High School in Cincinnati, a school much like Roosevelt.

In April, as previously mentioned, the chairperson of the Department of Education at Harris-Stowe State College, Dr. Nancy Gammon, and the dean of the School of Education at Maryville, Dr. Mary Ellen Finch, thought it would be best to gain a reaffirmation from Gene Gladstone, the newly appointed principal of Roosevelt, for the project. The reaffirmation was strong.

Many things were discussed as possibilities at that first April meeting including finding out from Roosevelt teachers what they think the institutions of higher education could provide for them; exploring the possibility of designating Roosevelt as a magnet for high school students interested in becoming teachers; and noting the need for Roosevelt faculty and staff to become more involved in the Professional Development School Collaborative and other meetings. These suggestions were forwarded on to the governance group.

The governance group, during its next meeting in April, agreed to Dr. Gammon using a survey to collect data from teachers and faculty at Harris-Stowe about joint needs and offerings. The group decided to check out the possibility of making a trip to Cincinnati to visit Aiken High School (overtures were made, but it was too late in the year for such a trip); Mr. Gladstone reported that there was interest in his building among students for a career in teaching. Much was talked about at this meeting, but no clear goals emerged at this time for further work. To achieve such a thing, it is believed that the group may need to have a retreat where significant time is spent together working on a plan. Our "after school/late in the day" meetings have not been a vehicle achieving significant planning. Roosevelt teachers have had trouble finding substitutes so they might attend day meetings away from the building. This is a problem in many high schools where teachers hate to leave their classrooms; it is exacerbated at Roosevelt where it is difficult to find substitutes to replace teachers who are gone for a day. Strategies for securing this release for them will need to be found.

Also, a more significant number of people from all settings are going to have to be involved for this to work. Few teachers at Roosevelt probably know much about the partnership, other than working with the students from the teacher education programs who worked in their classes. Perhaps the survey of the RHS faculty members' needs will be a first step in involving the faculty at Roosevelt in a broader sense. Much will depend on the commitment of the new principal as well. Much also depends on helping the teachers at Roosevelt learn that this is a project in which they will have voice.

The year was much like a chronology of "process" which appears to lack substance. The goal conceptually talks of "extending the conversation with our partners" and "continuing the partners in simultaneous renewal," but in reality we were nowhere ready for that. The words sounded nice on the page but, in many ways, we were learning to trust each other enough to have a conversation. This must be seen as a prerequisite to forming a partnership. And for renewal to be simultaneous (for the tough issues to be addressed together), it seems the partnership has to be securely established and well. Perhaps the first goal should have been, in retrospect, just to "unpack" the term "partnership" and to examine those implications for each participant, and/or to examine the perceptions we had of each other.

There is, now, more trust and knowledge of each other. It is amazing sometimes how long it can take to make these initial inroads to each other. The formal "beginnings" of relationships–the

filling out of joint applications–is one thing. But getting to know and trust each other, especially those from different institutional cultures, takes time. This seems to be even truer in high schools and colleges that can be so insular in nature because of the department structure inherent in both. We must acknowledge the time and energy required to begin renewal agendas where no prior relationships existed. We must be patient with those in the beginnings, helping them to identify those issues and questions which must be addressed first and understanding that those beginnings look more like process than substance, especially when trust and commitment need to be developed.

➢ **Goal #2: To extend the dialogue about teaching and learning, engaging preservice teachers with experienced teachers and university and college faculty in the process.**

Some of the end was achieved here, but possibly not through the vehicle initially intended and not as a partnership of the whole. Both preservice teachers from Maryville and Harris-Stowe were engaged independently in dialogues about teaching with Roosevelt teachers as they talked about individual classrooms and the teaching/learning occurring there. Those discussions were mostly one-on-one discussions, occurring when practicum students were placed in classes with teachers. Maryville students, Harris-Stowe students, and the faculty of Roosevelt and the higher education institutions never met jointly for conversations.

In the fall, Maryville had nine students in the building for four mornings a week for approximately seven weeks. These students were assigned to one teacher in a classroom where they tutored and taught lessons. They also took a class that was delivered on site at Roosevelt. No Harris-Stowe students were involved in the discussions during this seminar. In the spring, eight students from Harris-Stowe spent one hour a week in the building in conjunction with a course they were taking back at Harris-Stowe. Much rich discussion occurred in their class about their learning at Roosevelt.

The following section includes some information extrapolated from course evaluation forms, student journals, and notes from the college supervisors about the time spent at Roosevelt. Included here are events, observations from the students, and some actual quotes from both college students and students at Roosevelt.

Reflections of Maryville Interns Placed at Roosevelt:

These students were Maryville graduate students working towards a Master's degree in secondary education and certification. These students were placed in Roosevelt in the fall in their second practicum placement. All of these students were Caucasian and grew up in families where English was the first language. Some had attended private high schools, others had attended primarily suburban public high schools. A few of the nine were somewhat apprehensive about

venturing into an urban high school. It was the first time Maryville students had ever been placed at Roosevelt.

Observation #1: Roosevelt lost its physics teacher during the first weeks of school and could only locate a substitute who really knew little about physics. A Maryville intern helped the substitute plan and deliver many lessons in the fall. When the intern "went in," the substitute was having the students learn the concepts through vocabulary tests and memory work. The intern devised as many meaningful demonstrations as she could to help explain concepts like friction, inertia, mass, weight, and gravity. Though she still experienced frustration in getting kids to write things down, they often became very engaged in active experiments. She talked about how this helped her understand the need for engaging demonstrations around concept learning.

Observation #2: One intern was intrigued by "Mr. Q." Mr. Q. would plant himself at his door between classes. He would not let any student enter without a greeting of some sort. This teacher impressed upon the young intern the importance of getting to know every student. The intern remarked, "He knows all about the lives of these kids. They come to him some days when they don't go to other classes . . . just to talk." The intern placed with this teacher was himself struggling with rapport. He saw first hand the importance of getting to know the students.

Observation #3: Although uncertain about Roosevelt before they spent time there, MU interns became great defenders of the school to others. On the MU campus, during a program about the St. Louis desegregation program, the interns challenged local educators about the inequities in the court order that puts naturally integrated schools (Roosevelt) on the low end of the totem pole. These schools receive fewer resources and fewer "breaks." Students really saw first hand the issues of access to knowledge through access to resources. They stated that they never would have understood this had they not experienced it "up close and personal."

Observation #4: Teachers at Roosevelt have the challenge of working in classes where some students exhibit irregular attendance patterns. As one science teacher put it, "We are working to help kids understand that every day counts." Preservice candidates from Maryville concluded one day in seminar that maybe teachers overuse worksheets in these urban schools because after a while it just becomes easier for make-up . . . and becomes a habit which is too hard to break.

Observation #5: At a debriefing between one teacher and an intern, the teacher commented that for urban teachers, it is sometimes difficult not to lose hope right along with your students. He commented about how refreshing it was to have the interns in the building. In fact, he talked about going back to school for a course.

Observation #6: As stated before, students were apprehensive about Roosevelt. But after the experience, some concluded that students at Roosevelt on the whole were more appreciative than students in more suburban settings. They also felt some had better manners.

Observation #7: Words from an intern: "I don't think I would have fully understood the complexities of an urban school from reading literature, watching movies, or hearing stories. Our time spent at the school was the main reason I know what an urban school truly is like. I know that most kids want to learn, and they care about their learning. Just because kids come from a lower socioeconomic status doesn't mean they don't care about school. I also saw that these kids need variety. This teaching by worksheet doesn't get it. I know what it feels like to stand in line and go through a metal check . . . to see security guards all over. I've seen kids struggle who don't understand English . . . who plagiarize because they don't have strategies. But I know they care. I have observed teachers who can no longer care, and have observed those who will never stop caring and trying . . . who will always be there for these kids. I know I am a better teacher because I spent time with the students at Roosevelt."

Observation #8: One student felt that teachers in suburban schools seem more interested or able to appeal to kids' interests in the classroom. She felt that suburban teachers may "cover" less in their efforts to engage students–while the urban teacher covers more, but engages less. Students would do the work, but this student did not feel students acquired a depth of meaning.

Observation #9: During one of our seminars, a student was stabbed in the hall outside our door. Within seconds, there were newscasters and news trucks on the grounds of the school. The interns noticed that the urban schools get much more of this negative coverage. They observed that things like this happen in suburban schools, but are often kept quiet and out of the news. They started monitoring more closely the types of articles about urban vs. suburban schools.

Reflections of Harris-Stowe Students Placed at Roosevelt (and from students with whom they worked):

Eight Harris-Stowe students observed and worked with students at Roosevelt in the spring in conjunction with their reading course.

Observation #1: "There were two boys, both in the ninth grade, who seemed to have hard shells on the outside. The longer I was there, the softer they became. They talked to me more and smiled back often." (Harris-Stowe preservice teacher)

Observation #2: "This broadened my concept of what teaching is all about. It's hard to reach these kids. They basically think they are adults in many ways. Some have children; some work and deal with many of the things adults do, so I guess they are." (Harris-Stowe preservice teacher)

Observation #3: "Some of these kids find it hard to care about schooling. You have to work hard to find ways to show them why it is going to be important to them." (Harris-Stowe preservice teacher)

Observation #4: "When Harris-Stowe students come to help us, it provides a good example for us." (Roosevelt student)

Observation #5: "I like it when the college students get more involved. It helps with classroom participation. I think we could also teach them some things." (Roosevelt student)

Observation #6: "These students from Harris-Stowe are a lot like us. They can teach us about life." (Roosevelt students)

There was other dialogue about teaching and learning at Roosevelt this year though the discussions may not have been held broadly throughout the building. Nancy Williams and Kathe Rasch from Maryville University talked with the Roosevelt teachers after the Maryville students were there. Some of these teachers talked about the power that came from once again talking about their craft, and about how having new blood in their classroom had helped them see themselves again in relationship to their students. The higher education partners feel that these initial steps into the building helped them to develop beginning relationships with some teachers and staff.

The power of the lessons learned by the preservice students, however, should not to be forgotten. Much was learned about equity and the equal access to educational opportunity. Let's face it–few take their teacher preparation programs into urban schools. We did, and many benefited from the experience. We did not achieve our goal completely, but we may be more ready, now, to actually work toward it. Only through this sort of "inclusive of all partners" conversation will we take needed steps toward understanding, then addressing, how we can all help each other understand issues of teaching and learning and access to knowledge.

- **Goal #3: To provide support for Roosevelt teachers to join teachers from Parkway South High School in a "Leadership Program" focusing upon high school issues only. This dialogue will include readings and conversations about the Coalition of Essential Schools' principles and how these principles have been played out in other urban, as well as suburban, schools. Also part of this conversation will be readings on school reform, site-based management, and the teaching/learning process.**

In short, we were not ready for this to happen. Four Roosevelt teachers began the Consortium Leadership Program (based on the Institute for Educational Inquiry's Leadership Associates' Program). Two of these teachers left Roosevelt and did not complete the program, but two did finish. These two teachers (one in special education and the other a computer specialist) did not know each other well before they began, but formed a linkage during the program and have now completed an inquiry project together which will improve computer learning for learning disabled students at Roosevelt. We did not achieve, however, our goal of forming a group specific to the two high schools. In short, we were overly ambitious, especially considering the nature of high schools and the intricacy of bringing three, let alone four, institutions together in a meaningful way.

Conclusions

What happens when three diverse populations enter into a partnership when the parties have little prior knowledge and experience with each other? Initially, there can be what appears to be superficial process as the parties (not yet ready to be partners) establish lines of communication, get to know and trust one another, and work toward a time when they are actually ready to establish goals they jointly understand and are ready to pursue. In this "partnership," we created goals that were too ambitious for our context. Perhaps because the two higher education partners had been engaged in this type of work in other contexts before, they came in thinking "further down the line" than was realistic for this site. It may be time to back up and work first on the complexity of the concept of partnership in this specific site–to converse about and investigate what that means.

- The trust needed to have those conversations began to develop this year through the multiple meetings held by the new governance group and through the placement of preservice students in Roosevelt by both higher education partners.

- Conversations began to emerge between various parties about teaching and learning; these conversations were neither joint nor broadly held, but they were a necessary beginning.

- The faculty at Harris-Stowe has surveyed teachers at Roosevelt about their needs; this could lead to more joint conversations and programming.

- Through a Consortium Leadership Program, two teachers at Roosevelt "found" each other and began a "partnership" which will benefit learning disabled students.

- Preservice teachers experienced the workings of an urban high school, walking away with positive things to say about the teaching there and also understanding better the issues of equal access to knowledge which sometimes plague urban settings.

Working with any three institutions is difficult, but when one is also experiencing continued changes in leadership the effort is slowed. We will again need to seek commitment from the new high school leadership. But we know that we have begun the job of building bridges and strategies for communication. The work is difficult and time consuming; egos must be placed aside as we focus on the prize. Difficult work . . . but real in that we are working together. Together. A new concept full of complexities . . . but the only road to partnership and simultaneous renewal.

Initiating a Secondary Professional Development School: The Westfield High School/Texas A&M University Partnership

By William H. Peters, Texas A&M University

Out of Need Comes a Purpose

How does a school in a large metropolitan area such as Houston, Texas, noted for its academic excellence, maintain that excellence in a changing school population? How does such a school address the increasing problems that students experience in learning? How does such a school develop processes and procedures that enable teachers to experience success with an economically and ethnically diverse student population? These were questions that caused a felt need to develop among the faculty at a Houston area high school.

How does a university moving toward field-based teacher education programs and located in College Station, Texas, a somewhat rural community, provide for its students circumstances that are similar to those the students will face in their teaching careers? How does a university whose preservice teacher education population still remains largely Anglo best prepare those students to successfully teach an economically and ethnically diverse public school population? These were questions that challenged a Carnegie Research I university.

A Changing Society

Demographers predict that by the year 2000 one in three Americans will be non-white (American Council on Education and the Education Commission of the States, 1988). The 1990 Census reported that 25 percent of the population in the United States classified themselves as non-European Americans. When considering culturally diverse children the percentage is even higher. Fifty-one percent of school-aged children in California belong to ethnic minority groups; in New York State, 40 percent do. Other data reflect that Hispanic, Asian-American, and African-American populations will grow at a much faster rate than that of Anglo-Americans. By the year 2030, the white population in the state of Texas is projected to constitute 36.7 percent of the state's population, as compared to the current 60.7 percent. The black population is expected to dip from 11.7 to 9.5 percent, while the Hispanic population is projected to be 45.9 percent as compared to the 25.5 percent of the current population. Other ethnicities that currently make up 2.1 percent of the state's population are projected to be 7.9 percent (Nelson, 1997). Minorities already have become the majorities in Texas public school elementary classrooms. Teachers, both in the United States and in

Texas, must be prepared to work with this ever-growing population as well as to prepare all students to interact effectively in an increasingly multicultural American society.

Westfield High School

Westfield High School is located twenty miles north of downtown Houston, Texas, in suburban Harris County. The area is a mix of residential, commercial, and agricultural properties. The school is noted for its academics with 30 to 40 percent of its student population enrolled in one or more honor courses, with 350 of its almost 3,000-student population in Advanced Placement classes, and with almost 70 percent of its students attending college after graduation. The school has become reflective of America's changing society. Indeed, the school's student minority population is now in the majority, 58 percent to 42 percent.

Texas A&M University

Located in South Central Texas some eighty miles from north Houston, Texas A&M University is the third largest university in the United States and is one of the largest sources of new teachers in the state of Texas. The College of Education offers NCATE approved programs at the baccalaureate elementary and secondary levels. Goodlad's nineteen postulates undergird newly established undergraduate programs in teacher certification that have moved toward community-based partnerships, strong collaborative relationships with public schools, and collaboration across disciplines to deliver its innovative programs.

Conversation: The Basis for What Can Be

It was the needs of Westfield High School and of Texas A&M University that gave purpose for entering into a dialogue relating to the development of a professional development school at Westfield High School. These needs placed students at Westfield High School and students in the secondary teacher preparation program at Texas A&M University at the center of the conversation. Westfield High School as a potential partner school developed in a unique way–faculty both at Westfield High School and at Texas A&M University put aside personal and discipline-centered interests for the goal of providing the best instruction and teachers for our youth (see Grossman and Stodolsky, 1995, for an in-depth discussion of the challenges in developing university/school partnerships on the secondary level). Thus, providing best instruction and teachers for our youth is the framework within which this portrait is created.

Prior activities between the Spring Independent School District and the College of Education at Texas A&M University had been mutually positive in their results. For example, the Spring ISD had participated with Texas A&M in studies and solutions to the student dropout rate as well as in approaches to teachers as researchers. With that positive foundation, the Spring Independent School District initiated discussions with Texas A&M University regarding the development of Westfield High School as a professional development school.

A lesson both institutions had learned over the years was that collaboration in improving educational excellence cannot occur from top-down changes (see Maeroff, 1993; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). An exploratory meeting at Westfield High School was held, involving central school administrators, Westfield High School administrators, representative faculty from each of the departments in the school, the dean of Texas A&M University's College of Education, and faculty from key departments related to teacher education in the College. It was only after this meeting's open discussion related to the mutual benefits of collaboration, only after each faculty on its own campuses further discussed the support for collaboration, and only after continued meetings of an advisory group made up of representatives from each of the institutions that formal position papers were written. These papers put forth the basic concept/structure for a professional development school and the establishment of a joint appointment position funded by both institutions (see Appendix I). Open and sincere conversations over a period of time (1995-96) built the foundation for mutual trust and made possible that which can be.

The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instructional Services in the Spring ISD was pivotal in these discussions and was central to each of the phases in the development of Westfield as a PDS. The ongoing participation of a strong central office administrator is essential to the initiation of a secondary PDS. It is clear that this administrator's active participation in the conversations begun in the summer of 1995 was of primary importance in the development of the Westfield High School Professional Development School, and his role was instrumental in gaining the Spring Independent School Board formal approval of Westfield as a PDS on May 7, 1996. The assistant superintendent's involvement not only gave support to the public school perspective but provided his understanding of the District's five-year framework within which Westfield could play a significant role as a PDS in assisting to reach several district goals.

Concepts Become Reality

If the central goal of a professional development school is providing best instruction and teachers for our youth, what that best instruction is and who the best teachers are becomes a continuous journey, given the constant societal changes. Westfield High School as a professional

development school, therefore, was established formally as a Center of Inquiry. As a Center of Inquiry, the school became a laboratory for maintaining a climate in which students value academic achievement; a faculty that is continually growing, improving, and grappling with challenges presented by a changing student population; and opportunities for preservice teacher experiences. Teacher education, then, is viewed as a means by which to improve both teaching and teacher education, and teacher education ownership is viewed as residing exclusively in neither a school district nor in a university but as a collaborative process of which the only goal is to provide the best teachers for our youth. The conceptual structure of the Westfield High School Professional Development School was thus designed for the simultaneous renewal of the school and of the university teacher education program.

Initial plans in establishing Westfield as a collaborative Center of Inquiry have been directed toward making the school a student teaching center and involving Westfield faculty in teacher research. Longer-term plans include involving high school teachers, preservice teachers, and university faculty in study teams focused on problems Westfield High School students experience in learning and on the processes and procedures that enable teachers to experience success with an economically and ethnically diverse and changing student population. Other study team topics will include fostering and creating a framework for teacher research initiatives arising from the questions and problems investigated in study teams, providing early field experiences for teacher education students, and providing opportunities for local graduate study for Spring ISD faculty.

A major move toward accomplishing such plans was the creation of a Clinical Master Teacher position, a joint position of Texas A&M University and Westfield High School and funded jointly by TAMU and Spring ISD. It was agreed that the occupant of the position would be compensated according to the Spring ISD salary scale and would receive Spring ISD benefits. Evaluation would be according to established Spring ISD and TAMU procedures.

The position was advertised and a selection committee consisting of three members of the Spring ISD staff and three members of the TAMU faculty interviewed candidates and recommended the preferred candidate to the principal of Westfield High School and the head of the Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction at TAMU. Out of a field of excellent candidates, a thirteen-year veteran employee of the Spring Independent School District at Westfield High School was selected. In those years, she had reflected numerous instances of professional growth, had established a reputation as an outstanding teacher and colleague and had been involved during several summers with the teacher education department of a small state university.

The quality of the Clinical Master Teacher has been crucial to the success of the partner school. She has brought to the position the shared goals, knowledge, and understanding of both entities in the PDS; provided opportunities for teachers to share in the governance of the school and problem solving through study teams; enhanced the self-image of teachers by providing them with

leadership roles; provided on-site training of prospective teachers and a strong support network for them; established classrooms as live laboratories for university students; and encouraged professional growth through ongoing modeling, mentoring, and reflection.

Organizing for Implementation

The work of the TAMU/Westfield Professional Development School is directed by a Steering Committee appointed by the dean of the College of Education and the principal of Westfield High School. Members of the committee include two high school students, four high school faculty, the clinical associate (joint position), the principal, the assistant superintendent, two preservice teachers, four university faculty members, and the dean of the College of Education. At its April 1997 meeting, the Steering Committee recommended including two parent representatives as members.

The Steering Committee has responsibility for developing and adopting plans for each year, establishing direction for staff development and continuing education, developing and supporting study teams and associated teacher research, and developing and supporting a post-baccalaureate teacher education program. Additionally, the Steering Committee is responsible for developing an evaluation plan designed to monitor and evaluate the processes and outcomes of the professional development school.

The Development and Implementation of Professional Development School Activities

Two forms of teacher inquiry form the basis of professional development for school and university faculty in the professional development school. Study teams (involving groups of school- and university-based faculty, administrators, and students) define and investigate problems of student learning. Teacher research projects, formulated as a result of study team activities or initiated independently by school- and university-based researchers, extend the work of the study teams through more systematic investigation of problems. To support inquiry, graduate-level courses designed to meet the needs of PDS faculty are to be offered on site and through distance learning technology. Possible course topics include teacher research methodology, strategies for improving teaching and learning in diverse classrooms, and knowledge and skills associated with supervision of student teachers.

A Classroom Management Study Team was formed in December 1996 when teachers responded to a survey of concerns they had pertaining to the school. Student conduct was one of the most frequently mentioned concerns. When students do not behave in positive ways, learning diminishes and teacher morale lowers.

The first step was to explore the situation. The study team surveyed a sampling of students about their own behaviors at school and teachers used an observation form to record objectively the behaviors in their own classes (see Appendix II). The team reviewed administrative office summaries of student offenses resulting in placement in detention halls or the extension center. From all the data collected, it was concluded that the core of the problem was a lack of respect–for self, for authority, for property, for peers. Most of the behavior violations derived from the disrespect students manifested.

Team members researched what discipline management systems had been formulated to deal with student behavior. Using the Internet, the Region VI Service Center, and the professional development library, a great deal of information was gathered to provide a basis for the district's Five-Year Education Plan Committee to improve student discipline. Two members of the study team are participating on the district committee.

A recently formed study team is focusing on the 41-point gap in scores between Anglo and black students and on the honors classes. The major thrust for this team is to study ways to address the learning problems of students and to gain greater minority student participation in honors classes through recruitment and retention in these classes.

The structure of the professional development school promotes not only the collaborative nature of research but the collaborative presentation of its findings. For example, research project presentations were delivered by faculty of Spring ISD and Texas A&M University at recent meetings of the American Educational Research Association, the Southwestern Educational Research Association, the Texas School/University Research Collaborative, and the Houston Suburban School Chapter of the Texas Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

The Teacher Education Program

While the above projects strive to answer the challenges of a changing student population, renewal of the university teacher education program is simultaneously taking place. A Secondary Education Collaborative has redesigned the secondary education program at Texas A&M University. The Collaborative is composed of representatives from each of the content disciplines offering teaching fields in the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Science, the College of Geoscience, and the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences; representatives associated with teacher education from throughout the College of Education; practicing teachers from middle and senior schools from each of the teaching fields and representing various school districts; and principals and central office personnel representing various school districts. As a member of this Collaborative, the Westfield PDS is proving critical in facilitating components of the redesign. For example, Westfield is creating a

systematic approach to selecting cooperating teachers who have a commitment to the professional development school concept.

Faculty members interested in becoming cooperating teachers fill out a profile that allows student teacher assignments to be less random. In the profile application, teachers indicate how they rank themselves in terms of strictness and innovative lessons, what they have done to grow professionally, their willingness to participate in seminars and/or study teams after school, and what they have to offer a novice teacher (see Appendix III). By comparing the answers provided on the student teachers' profiles to those of the cooperating teacher candidates, the possibility of matching personalities for greater compatibility and involving greater numbers of teachers in the work of the PDS increases. Many of the cooperating teachers believe this method makes the process in the PDS seem more professional.

Near the end of the first year as a PDS, another modification grew out of a cooperating teacher's presentation at a state meeting, entitled "Mentoring a Student Teacher as a Way to Achieve Professional Growth." Teachers are now recognizing that serving as a cooperating teacher improves one's own teaching. This recognition has provided an impetus to encourage all interested teachers to apply. Training in mentoring and supervising is provided to interested teachers.

Technology is central to additional renewal processes. Early field experiences that are similar to those preservice teachers will face in their teaching careers is being provided through distance learning. Westfield High School teachers in the various teaching fields are volunteering to have their classes observed through interactive television. During the fall 1997 semester, students in a required on-campus educational psychology course will view the Westfield classes of a Spanish teacher and a biology teacher at various times during the semester. A debriefing/questioning session with both teachers through interactive television will follow the class observations.

In its recent renovations, Westfield High School developed a teaching theater and put into place accompanying technology compatible with the technology at Texas A&M University. The theater will permit cooperating teachers and their students to be in contact with the Texas A&M campus as necessary or desired and will be used this fall to offer a distance learning graduate course on the processes of mentoring and supervising student teachers which was requested by the high school faculty . Technology is answering the challenge of distance.

Texas A&M University requires that colleges submit strategic plans for its various programs. Each program component in the Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction was requested to forward its strategic plan. The Westfield Professional Development School Steering Committee served as a reviewing panel for the undergraduate secondary education program's strategic plan and provided specific goals in that plan for the PDS. Thus, the PDS is part of the continuing planning process for the secondary education program.

How Do You Know if the PDS is Effective?

Improving learning in conditions of cultural diversity is the theme of the Westfield/TAMU partnership. This theme provides for the simultaneous investigation of approaches, both to improved instruction in the school classroom and improved teacher preparation in the university program. A systematic assessment of the degree of success in meeting the theme of the partnership, however, is necessary. To what degree is the purpose that grew out of the needs of both school and university being met by the partnership? To what degree are changes in the teaching/learning process taking place, and are the changes, if made, successful? How effective is the professional development school process? The Steering Committee identified the development of an ongoing research and evaluation plan to study the processes and outcomes of the professional development school as one of its initial activities. This plan provides for a heuristic for the data collection process for the evaluation of both the secondary education program and the secondary professional development school, including both processes and outcomes.

An Initial Year of Insights

Tensions between institutional and individual commitment and relationships diminish when both a high school's administration and faculty and a university's administration and faculty place concern on problems that students experience in learning and on the processes and procedures that enable teachers to experience success with an economically and ethnically diverse changing school population. Tensions also diminish when both institutions place concern on collaborating to find solutions to such challenges. When both high school and university students are the center of conversation, a common institutional and individual commitment emerges.

Making a professional development school central to an organization provides a greater challenge, especially when a school is large and its faculty and staff numbers over two hundred. Increasing the involvement of teachers in the school is necessary, perhaps by providing sessions on the professional development school on staff development days when those already heavily involved from both the high school and university faculties share their experiences and provide opportunities for others to become more involved. It was out of just such sessions that Westfield teachers previously less involved have offered their classes for observation and interaction with university students.

Working together to solve educational problems also makes clear the strengths of both high school and university faculty. Recognition of the commonalities among the different institutional cultures begins to outweigh their differences. A collegial relationship soon develops through

program presentations and scholarly publications in which representatives of both cultures share their work.

Initiating a professional development school, however, is a slow process and hard work. Universities and public schools run on different "clocks," and calendar and time differences must be worked through in a mutually beneficial manner.

Starting with small activities that involve mutual interests allows for progress to be made. "Less is more" is an important recognition–an overly ambitious initial undertaking that may not bear fruit can affect the likelihood of building a successful PDS.

Westfield High School Professional Development School as a Center of Inquiry may provide a model for some schools facing similar educational problems. Yet it would appear that each professional development school must develop its own model emerging from a purpose. And each purpose may be different. Structure without purpose is nothing. With purpose, it is everything.

Where Does One Go From Here?

A professional development school can grow only as its constituents grow. At Westfield, the community of learners is understood to be the young learners, their teachers, their campus administrators and staff, and their parents as well as university professors and preservice teachers at Texas A&M University. All of these people comprise the membership of the Westfield High School Professional Development School. The students who serve on the Steering Committee, assist at sessions of the professional development school on staff development days, and participate in pilot studies; the teachers who open their classrooms for external examination; the campus administrators who serve to aid in facilitating professional growth; the parents whose support of the professional development school concept is crucial; the university professors who are in the field learning with their public school colleagues; and the preservice teachers who step into the reality of the PDS classrooms through technology and through student teaching have come together and have built a firm foundation, but its structure is continually in the building stage. In addition to continuing to investigate learning problems through our study teams, we will be building instructional teams of university and public school teachers to instruct in the teacher education program, and we will be building Westfield as a possible model for a post-baccalaureate teacher education program, always moving toward providing the best instruction and the best teachers in an ever changing society.

***Note to the Reader: Appendices mentioned in the text are available upon request from the Institute for Educational Inquiry.*

References

American Council on Education and the Education Commission of the States. (1988). *One-Third of a Nation: A Report of the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life.*

Grossman, P. L. & Stodolsky, S. S. (1995). "Content as Context: The Role of School Subjects in Secondary School Teaching." *Educational Researcher.* 24, (8), 5-11.

Maeroff, G. (1983). *School and College.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nelson, Jenny. (June 30, 1997). "Bryan Council Told of Changes in Demographics." *Eagle.* Bryan: College Station. 2-3.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE